

BYZANTINE POLITICAL IDEAS  
IN KIEVAN RUSSIA

FRANCIS DVORNIK

## CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . .	75
I. Byzantine Influences on Slavic Jurisprudence . . . . .	76
II. Byzantine Collections of Canon Law . . . . .	78
III. Slavonic Translations of the Greek <i>Nomocanons</i> . . . . .	80
IV. Byzantine political Ideas in Justinian's Novels in Slavonic Texts . . . . .	81
V. Slavonic Translations of the <i>Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles</i> . . . . .	85
VI. Slavonic Translation of the Introduction to the <i>Ecloga</i> . . . . .	89
VII. The <i>Stoslovec</i> , the <i>Izborniks</i> , the <i>Chronicle of Hamartolus</i> . . . . .	91
VIII. The Relations between Byzantine Emperors and Kiev . . . . .	94
IX. Echoes of Byzantine Ideas in the <i>Russian Primary Chronicle</i> . . . . .	96
X. Relations between Church and State in Kiev on the Byzantine Model . . . . .	97
XI. The political Ideas of Ilarion . . . . .	102
XII. Luke Židjata, Jakov, Cyril of Turov . . . . .	106
XIII. Greek political Ideas in the <i>Pčela</i> . . . . .	108
XIV. The Metropolitan Nicephorus . . . . .	110
XV. The <i>Poučenje</i> of Vladimir Monomach . . . . .	112
XVI. Monarchic Tendencies in the Principality of Suzdal . . . . .	114
XVII. Ceremony of Accession to the Throne in Kiev . . . . .	116

## INTRODUCTION

THE history of Russian political philosophy presents many problems which still await solution. Most specialists concentrate their interest on the origin and growth of the autocratic regime in the Moscovite State, and various theories have been put forward to explain it, such as Byzantine influences, Mongol example, social and economic changes in Russian society, and psychological causes.<sup>1</sup>

It is generally thought that very little has survived from the early period of Russian history from which a more or less clear conception of the political ideas of the Kievan rulers might be constructed. It is customary to compare events in countries which derived their culture from Byzantium with the development which took place, at given periods, in countries of Western, Latin civilization. In this respect, the comparison seems to be unfavorable to Kievan Russia. Although the literary achievements of the first four centuries of Russian history after the conversion of the country by Byzantine missionaries are astonishingly numerous and varied, it is somewhat surprising not to find in this period any writings dealing with political theory. There are none of the "mirrors of princes" so popular in the West during the Carolingian period, and no passionate discussions on the limits of imperial and spiritual powers as appeared in the numerous Latin treatises from the eleventh century onward.

In the Slavonic literature of the Kievan period the reader must be satisfied with moral exhortations of a more or less general nature, with some allusions to polity in early Russian chronicles, and with a few biographical sketches of Kievan princes. This scarcity of political literature led specialists to consider Byzantine influences on the Kievan political regime as virtually negligible. Moreover, the native political institution of the Kievan State seemed too democratic to permit a more profound penetration of the Russian mind by Byzantine political ideas. Also all Russian cities had their *večes*<sup>2</sup> — city councils which participated in the government of the principalities or city-states — and the relations of the princes to their retinue and their subjects appear to have been patriarchal. All this seems to bear no comparison with the strict monarchic principles of Byzantine absolute rulers.

This impression is, however, deceiving. Although no Byzantine treatise

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the survey of Russian literature on the subject in V. Valdenberg, *Drevnerusskie učeniia o predelach tsarskoj vlasti* (Petrograd, 1916), pp. 1–27.

<sup>2</sup> On the Kievan and Slavic *večes* see the general remarks in the most recent Bulgarian work on the history of Slavic law by V. A. Miladinov, *Osnovi na istorija na slavjansko pravo*, 2nd ed. (Sofia, 1946), pp. 199–205.

on politics was translated into Slavonic during the Kievan period, the people and the rulers of the Kievan State had good opportunities of becoming acquainted with the main principles of Byzantine political philosophy. When the influence of their principles on the political evolution of Kiev is more carefully studied, it can be seen that many Byzantine ideas were incorporated into the political structure of the State of Kiev, and that they became a basis for Russia's further evolution.

The intellectuals of the Kievan period were not deprived of all opportunities to acquaint themselves with Byzantine political ideas. In this respect there is one kind of literary document whose study is neglected — Russian collections of canon law, translated from the Greek. There are extant not only canons of councils dealing with disciplinary and other ecclesiastical matters, but imperial novels and documents of imperial legislation concerning ecclesiastical affairs and interests. These documents are so impregnated with Byzantine ideas on kingship that clerics who used them constantly in Church administration could not have failed to be profoundly influenced by their innate political ideas; and clerics were naturally the advisers of princes. The fact that these documents were obtainable in the Slavonic language made them accessible to others besides priests. Because the collections of canon law were regarded as sacred and venerable by all Eastern Christians, the influence of the ideas they contained must have been all the more profound.

## I

It is necessary to examine first the extent to which the Russians were influenced by Byzantine legislation in the organization of their civil jurisprudence. Like other Indo-European nations, the Slavs had customary laws regulating the life of their tribes. The Eastern Slavic tribes developed their customary laws more than other Slavic groups, and, thanks to the leading role played by the Scandinavians in the building of the Kievan State, these laws were enriched by Germanic customs. However, unlike the Germanic nations who escaped the direct influence of Roman law, most of the Slavic nations were tutored in early Christian history by Byzantium where Roman law, codified by Theodosius II and Justinian I, was the mainspring of public life.

The Russians were converted by Byzantium toward the end of the tenth century. It would thus be logical to suppose that Byzantine missionaries brought with them also the official code of law then in force in Byzantium. This was the law handbook called *Procheiron*, published in the second half of the ninth century by the Emperor Basil I to replace the *Ecloga*, a hand-



book of abridged Roman law compiled by order of the iconoclastic Emperor Leo III and his son Constantine in 740.

It might be assumed that the *Procheiron* became the basis of the legal education of Kievan Russians. This, however, was not the case. Although it seems strange, there are good reasons for supposing that the juridical basis not only of Kievan Russia, but of all the new Slavic States which were christianized by Byzantium — Great Moravia, Bulgaria, Serbia and Russia — was built on the *Ecloga* which was banned by Basil I from the libraries of Byzantine courts.

Evidence of this fact has only recently been established. The first Slavonic handbook of law is a collection called *Zakon sudnyi ljudem* (Juridical Law for Laymen), and the origin and date of its composition are still objects of lively discussion among specialists. A thorough philological study of it, made by the Czech scholar J. Vařica,<sup>3</sup> has revealed a great affinity with the language used by the Byzantine missionary St. Constantine-Cyril who with his brother St. Methodius worked, from 863 onward, for the conversion of Moravia, and became the founder of Slavonic literature. The juridical document contains some expressions and words which could have been in use only in Moravia in the ninth century, and were misunderstood by Russian scribes, who later copied this document in Kievan Russia.

This would seem to show that when Prince Rastislav of Moravia sent his envoys to Constantinople about 862 he asked not only for missionaries speaking the Slavonic language, but, and above all, for a good code of laws. The Emperor Michael III sent the Moravian ruler the *Ecloga*, which was then still in official use in Constantinople, and charged Constantine-Cyril and his brother Methodius to establish on its basis a code of laws suitable for the new Slavic and Christian State. Constantine-Cyril composed the above-mentioned handbook adding to the twenty-nine titles, translated and adapted by him from the *Ecloga*, three others, based on Roman law, as it was known in the West at that time.

This Code must have reached Russia very soon after its conversion, most probably via Bulgaria, for it had been brought to that country, together with other Slavonic literary documents, when Methodius' disciples were expelled from Moravia after the death of the Saint in 885. This Code thus came to be used in Kievan courts, together with the *Russkaja Pravda* — Russian law — the first codification of Russian customary laws, which originated in the eleventh century.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> See his important study, "Origine Cyrillo-Méthodienne du plus ancien Code Slave dit 'Zakon sudnyi ljudem,'" in *Byzantinoslavica*, XII (1951), pp. 156-174

<sup>4</sup> See L. K. Goetz, *Das russische Recht*, I (Stuttgart, 1910), pp. 6-65, a reproduction of

The first Slavic Code became so popular in Kievan Russia that a second edition was made, probably in the eleventh century. To the original thirty-two titles, forty-five more were added. Sixteen of the new titles were adapted from a Greek handbook of "Mosaic Law"; the others were based on Byzantine law, but some of them reveal the influence of the *Russkaja Pravda*.<sup>5</sup>

The original *Zakon sudnyi ljudem* was incorporated into the official collection of Russian canon law — The Pilot's Book (*Kormčaja knjiga*) — and from the thirteenth century down to the present it remained an integral part of Russian canon jurisprudence. There, however, it is ascribed not to St. Constantine-Cyril, but to the Emperor Constantine the Great.

It is known that the original *Ecloga* was preceded by an introduction in which the iconoclastic emperor outlined excellently the legislative role of the emperors and their sublime position in Christian society.<sup>6</sup> The Slavs would thus have obtained at the moment of their christianization a telling definition of Byzantine ideas on kingship had St. Constantine-Cyril added the Emperor's introduction to his adaptation of the *Ecloga*. This, however, was omitted, and the oldest Slavonic Code of Law does not contain the introduction to the *Ecloga*.

## II

Documents of civil jurisprudence were, however, not the only ones to be inspired with Byzantine political ideas. The same was true about Byzantine collections of canon law. The oldest systematic work of this kind is the so-called *Nomocanon* of John Scholasticus, also known as John of Antioch, who became patriarch of Constantinople (565–577). He should most prob-

---

Sergejevič's edition of the *Russkaja Pravda* (St. Petersburg, 1904), with German translation. See *ibid.*, pp. 184 sq., on Russian customary law before Vladimir. English translation of the short and of the expanded version of the *Rus. Pravda* by G. Vernadsky, *Medieval Russian Law* (New York, 1947), pp. 26–60, with introduction and main bibliography. New edition by A. A. Zimin, *Pamjatniki prava Kievskago gosudarstva*, I (Moscow, 1952), pp. 71–232 (with commentary). The problem of to what extent the oldest version of the *Russkaja Pravda* was influenced by Byzantine Law is still debated among specialists. A survey of the Russian bibliography on this subject will be found in the study of E. Černousov, "K voprosu o vlianii vizantijskago prava na russkoe," *Vizantijskoe Obozrenie*, II (Jurjev, 1916), pp. 303–321. The author finds in the *Russkaja Pravda* numerous similarities to the Byzantine handbook, the *Ecloga*. On the influence of the *Procheiron* on Russian Law see M. Benemanskij, *Zakon gradskij. Značenie ego v russkom prave* (Moscow, 1917). Cf. also, V. Gsovski, "Roman Private Law in Russia," *Bulletino dell' Istituto di Diritto Romano*, N.S., V (Milan, 1939), pp. 364–375.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. K. Kadlec, *Introduction à l'étude comparative de l'histoire du droit public des peuples slaves* (Paris, 1933), pp. 78 sq.

<sup>6</sup> See below, p. 90, the translation of the introduction. See the reprint of Zachariae von Lingenthal's edition of the *Ecloga* in J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *Jus Graecoromanum*, II (Athens, 1931), pp. 5–62.

ably be identified with John Malalas,<sup>7</sup> the author of the *Chronography* in eighteen books, a Christian world chronicle, which had become very popular in Byzantium.

John Scholasticus used for his *Synagoge canonum*, another anonymous work, composed about the year 535, which contained conciliar canons divided into sixty titles and included also twenty-one contributions of Justinian dealing with ecclesiastical matters. From this material he compiled, about the years 548–550, his own collection of fifty titles, and added to it, in 565, an extract from Justinian's Novels, commonly known as the *Collectio LXXXVII capitulorum*.<sup>8</sup>

Another collection of canon law called the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles*, was probably composed during the reign of the Emperor Heraclius (629–641) by an anonymous author. In its original form it seems to have contained the so-called Apostolic canons, the decisions of the first four Oecumenical Councils and of the first eight local synods, together with prescriptions enunciated by the Holy Fathers of the first Christian centuries; imperial decrees concerning ecclesiastical affairs were also added. This compilation was more practical than the first, and soon became very popular. In later editions the decrees of more recent councils and imperial decisions were included. The most important revision of this *Nomocanon* was made under the Patriarch Photius, to whom it is usually erroneously ascribed. New imperial edicts together with the decisions of the synods of 861 and 879 were added to the "Photian" edition of 883. It appears that gradually the custom of inserting the imperial decrees in copies of the *Nomocanon* was abandoned, and the copyists merely added to the canonical decrees the handbooks of civil laws which were in use in Constantinople.<sup>9</sup> This shows that the name of these collections was well chosen, because they contained the ecclesiastical canons as well as decrees of the civil laws (*nomoi*), thus giving rise to the word *Nomocanon*.

<sup>7</sup> This seems to have been demonstrated by J. Haury in his study, "Johannes Malalas identisch mit den Patriarchen Johannes Scholasticos," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 9 (1900), pp. 336–356. On John's work on canon law see Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Historiae juris graecoromani delineatio* (Heidelberg, 1839), pp. 32, 33; and L. Petit's article, "Jean le Scholastique," in *Diction. de théol. cathol.*, vol. 8, cols. 829–831.

<sup>8</sup> The *Synagoge* was published for the first time by G. Voell and H. Justel in their *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris*, II (Paris, 1661), pp. 499–660, and a more complete edition was made by J. B. Pitra in his *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta*, II (Rome, 1868), pp. 385–405, on the basis of G. E. Heimbach's edition (*Anecdota*, II [Leipzig, 1840], pp. 202–234). Cf. also the general information on Greek and Slavonic collections of canon law given by N. Milaš in his work, *Das Kirchenrecht der Morgenländischen Kirche* (Zara, 1897), pp. 152–198.

<sup>9</sup> On the history and manuscript tradition of this Greek *Nomocanon*, see V. I. Benešević's work, *Kanoničeskij Sbornik XIV titulov* (St. Petersburg, 1905).

## III

It seems established that the first *Nomocanon* with which the Slavs became acquainted was the collection of fifty titles attributed to John Scholasticus.<sup>10</sup> The first translation of this collection is ascribed by many specialists to St. Methodius, apostle of the Slavs. This attribution is supported by the biographer of the Archbishop of Moravia who says that, at the end of his life, the Saint translated a *Nomocanon*.<sup>11</sup> The archaic language of this translation also supports this suggestion, as does the circumstance that this translation is accompanied in the manuscript by the first Slavic law handbook, the *Zakon sudnyi ljudem*. If it can be accepted that the latter document was compiled by St. Constantine-Cyril, Methodius' brother, it becomes easier to explain why these two documents were copied together.

The oldest Slavonic manuscript of Scholasticus' collection dates from the thirteenth century and is now kept in the *Gosudarstvennaja biblioteka S.S.S.R. imeni Lenin* (No. 230) though previously it was kept in the Rumjancev Museum. Although many experts hesitate to attribute this translation to St. Methodius, all are agreed that its language is very archaic. This document must have reached Kiev very soon after the conversion of the Russians; if not at the end of the tenth century, then certainly in the eleventh. It came from Bulgaria where a new translation of the collection, or an adaptation of Methodius' translation, was made at the end of the ninth or beginning of the tenth century.<sup>12</sup> At the time when the Bulgarians were definitely won over to the Byzantine form of Christianity, Scholasticus' collection was still in general use in Byzantium. It is, therefore, natural to suppose that this collection was brought to Bulgaria by Byzantine missionaries.

The Slavonic text of the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles* is preserved in the manuscript of Efrem dating from the eleventh century, which contains

<sup>10</sup> For details see the study in Czech — unfortunately without a résumé in a non-Slavic language — by Th. Saturník, "Příspěvky k šíření byzantského práva u Slovanů" (Contributions to the Problem of the Spread of Byzantine Law among the Slavs) published in the *Rozpravy* of the Czech Academy (Class I, no. 64, Prague, 1922), pp. 15 sq.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the French translation of the biography in F. Dvorník, *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance* (Prague, 1933), p. 391 (ch. XV). The Slavonic text gives also the verbal translation of the Greek word "Nomocanon" — *zakonu pravilo* — which was thenceforward used in old Slavonic literature. For the linguistic analysis of this translation see H. F. Schmid, *Die Nomokanon Übersetzung des Methodius* (Berlin, 1922).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. A. C. Pavlov's description of this "First Slavo-Russian Nomocanon," *Pervonačalnij slavjano-russkij Nomokanon* (Kazan, 1869). Cf. also his *Nomokanon pri boľšom Trebnikě*, 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1897), and his *Kurs tserkovnago prava*, ed. by I. M. Gromoglasov (Sv. Troickaja Lavra, 1902), paragraphs 36–40, pp. 109–132. Paragraphs 40–53 dealing with the "History of the Russian Canon Law" were translated by L. K. Goetz, in his *Kirchenrechtliche und kulturgeschichtliche Denkmäler Altrusslands* (Stuttgart, 1905), pp. 5–94.

the Pilot's Book of Ustjug, which was kept in the Synodical Library (No. 227) in Moscow. Again, however, the language of the translation is more ancient, and is similar to that of the translation of Scholasticus' collection. It seems to have originated in Bulgaria about the middle of the tenth century, although some Russian scholars were inclined to believe that it was composed in Russia by order of Prince Jaroslav the Wise of Kiev. Many Bulgarian words in the translation seem, however, to attest its Bulgarian origin.<sup>13</sup>

It is important, moreover, to stress that the Slavonic text is also accompanied by a translation of the *Ecloga* and the *Procheiron*.<sup>14</sup> The translator of the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles* used a Greek copy of the pre-Photian edition which contained, besides the canonical decrees, the two handbooks of Byzantine civil law – the *Ecloga* of Leo III and the *Procheiron* of Basil I – and translated them both. As Byzantine collections of canon law were not official publications, but works of private scholars, it is not surprising that both handbooks should have been added by the compiler to the canonical collection, although, in official life, the *Procheiron* had superseded the *Ecloga*. Both handbooks still figure in the official Code of Canon Law of the orthodox Slavs. So it happened that the legislative work of the iconoclastic emperors, discarded by the Byzantines, has survived in the Canon Law of Slavic Churches down to the present day.

#### IV

It is worth while examining first the Slavonic text of those collections and seeing if they contain any documents expressing Byzantine ideas on kingship. The imperial decrees translated into Slavonic, and contained in the 87 chapters of the *Nomocanon*, merit especial attention. It should be noted that, although this collection of imperial decrees was originally an integral part of Scholasticus' *Nomocanon*, the Russian Pilot's Book of Ustjug is a compilation of different canonical documents and the compiler acted on his own whim. The fact that he did not copy the eighty-seven chapters does not, however, mean that the Slavonic edition of the *Nomocanon* of Scholasticus, which was included in his compilation, did not contain the document in question.

On the contrary, this document was well known in Russia, because from the end of the eleventh century onward, it used to be added, independently,

<sup>13</sup> For more details, see Saturník, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. the Greek text of the *Procheiron* in J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *Jus Graecoromanum*, II, pp. 109–228 (reprinted from the edition by Zachariae von Lingenthal).

to translations of the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles*. The oldest copy is to be found in the Pilot's Book of Efrem, from the end of the eleventh century, mentioned above. It seems evident that the compiler of this Pilot's Book gave preference to the more practical canonical collection of fourteen titles, but added to it the eighty-seven chapters of imperial decrees which he found in Scholasticus' collection.

The compiler of the Pilot's Book of Ustjug must also have known the collection of imperial decrees in eighty-seven chapters, because in his "chapters on bishops" (fols. 79a–83b) he copied twenty headings of the collection.<sup>15</sup>

In the Slavonic manuscripts the collection of eighty-seven chapters is often ascribed to Gregory of Agrigentum (Gregorij Akragansky), a contemporary of John Scholasticus. Important extracts are to be found there of the following of Justinian's Novels, quoted as they appear in the collection: II, V, LXXXIII, XLVI, CXX, LII, LVII, XXXII, CXXXI, and also the text of most of the chapters of Novels III, LXXVII, CXXXII, CXXXIII, CXXXVII.

The translator introduces the collection of eighty-seven chapters in the following words:

"From the books of the divine [božestvenych] novels of Justinian, of divine memory [the text has: končiny, decease], different statutes, giving confirmation of equal excellence to divine and worldly canons [saving them] from extinction."

The collection starts then with the introduction to the famous Novel VI, giving a very clear idea of Justinian's views on the relations between the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium*:<sup>16</sup>

"God's greatest gifts to men coming from above from His love of mankind [*philanthropia*] are — the priesthood [*sacerdotium*] and the *imperium* [*basileia*] of which the former serves divine interests, the latter has control over human interests and watches over them: both come from the same principle and adorn human life. Hence nothing claims the emperors' care so much as the dignity of the priests, since these continually pray to God for them. If [moral] integrity is found everywhere [on both sides], and full

<sup>15</sup> The collection was published for the first time by Baron G. A. Rozenkamp in *Obozrenie Kormčej Knigy*, 2nd ed., Append. VIII (St. Petersburg, 1839). The text is, however, not from the manuscript of Rjazan, as the editor says, but from the printed edition of the Russian Pilot's Book. I. Sreznevskij (*Obozrenie drevnich russkich spisikov Kormčej Knigy* [Survey of old Russian Manuscripts of the Pilot's Book], in *Sbornik otč. russk. jaz. i slov.*, edited by the Academy of St. Petersburg, 1897, vol. LXV, no. 2, pt. 2, pp. 66–134), published in the collection according to the mss. of Efrem's Pilot's Book (eleventh century), and according to the mss. of Novgorod (from 1280). A new edition of the collection, on the basis of the available manuscript tradition, was given by V. N. Beneševič in *Drevne-slavjanskaja Kormčaja XIV titulov*, I (St. Petersburg, 1906), pp. 739–807 with the Greek original.

<sup>16</sup> Sreznevskij, *op. cit.*, pp. 66, 67; Beneševič, *op. cit.*, pp. 739, 740.

trust in God, and if [every one of them] honors [adorns] well in the same manner [the way of life] entrusted to him, a kind of harmony will arise which can only prove useful to the human race.

“We believe that this will happen if one observes and keeps the holy canons which the rightly praised and revered eyewitnesses of God’s word, the Apostles and holy Fathers, have both preserved and explained.”<sup>17</sup>

The introduction to Novel VI is one of the most important texts defining the basic ideas of Byzantine political thought. The divine origin of the *imperium* and *sacerdotium*, the necessity of intimate collaboration between these two main factors in human society, the emperor’s role in establishing a harmony between the spiritual and temporal powers, and his right, or duty rather, to watch over the Church are all defined in this introduction. The emperor’s role is stressed in the different chapters of the novel dealing with an eminently ecclesiastical matter — the ordination of bishops, priests and deacons. Justinian simply gives authoritative orders — *sancimus*, *θεσπίζομεν* in Greek — which in Slavonic is “propovědaemŭ” (we order).

The Russians of the tenth and eleventh centuries could thus learn the main Byzantine political ideas from this document.

Other novels quoted in the Slavonic document must have impressed Russian readers in the same way. In Novel LXXXIII, translated textually into Slavonic, the Emperor, at the request of the Patriarch Menas himself, extended to the priests the privilege given by him to the monks of being judged first by their bishops. In Novel CXXXI, the Emperor declares that the canons of the first oecumenical councils have the value of civil laws and orders that the decisions of said councils should be regarded with the same respect as Holy Writ. The Emperor’s order interferes further with purely ecclesiastical

<sup>17</sup> The translator must have been well aware of the importance of Justinian’s definition, because at the end of his short introduction quoted above, he speaks again of “the great gifts of God.” The Slavonic and Greek texts do not give the whole introduction to the Novel. Only the beginning was extracted by the Greek compiler and translated word for word into Slavonic. The rest is abridged in a slightly changed form. The main idea, however, is clear from the Greek extract and the Slavonic translation, as it develops from comparison with the Latin text of the part of the introduction which is abridged in our document: *Nam si hoc* [i.e. *sacerdotium*] *quidem inculpabile sit undique et apud deum fiducia plenum, imperium autem recte et competenter exornet traditam sibi rempublicam, erit consonantia quaedam bona, omne quicquid utile est humano conferens generi.* The following passage is omitted in the translation: *Nos igitur maximam habemus sollicitudinem circa vera dei dogmata et circa sacerdotum honestatem, quam illis obtinentibus credimus quia per eam maxima nobis dona dabuntur a deo, et ea, quae sunt, firma habebimus, et quae nondum hactenus venerunt, adquirimus. Bene autem universa geruntur et competenter, si rei principium fiat decens et amabile deo.* The end is slightly changed: *Hoc autem futurum esse credimus, si sacrarum regularum observatio custodiatur quam iuste laudati et adorandi inspectores et ministri dei verbi tradiderunt apostoli, et sancti patres et custodierunt et explanaverunt.* R. Schoell, G. Knoll, *Novellae, Corpus juris civilis*, III (Berlin, 1923), pp. 35, 36.

matters, for he gives second place in the Church to the patriarch of Constantinople, and delineates the jurisdiction of his new foundation — *Justiniana Prima*. In Novel CXXIII Justinian declares again that he is adding new laws to the old ones enacted by him concerning bishops and the clergy, and proclaims severe sanctions against disobedient clergy. All these novels are quoted in the Slavic collection<sup>18</sup> and the translation gives the full meaning of the Greek original.

To the collection of eighty-seven chapters, more of Justinian's Novels were added: Novels III, LXXVII, CXXXII, CXXXIII, CXXXVII, LXVII, CXXIII. The text of most of the chapters of these Novels was accepted by the Greek compiler, and translated word for word by the Slavonic translator. Ideas similar to those encountered in the collection of eighty-seven chapters are expressed in these Novels.

In Novel III the Emperor referred to the numerous laws he had enacted concerning the clergy and to the fact that he had promulgated a new decree restricting the number of clergy in Constantinople and in other Churches. The translator gives almost word for word the text of the three chapters of the Novel. In Novel LXXVII the Emperor, after exhorting all his subjects to fear God and to implore His clemency, threatened with severe punishments all those guilty of blasphemy. In Novel CXXXII the Emperor forbade heretics to proselytise for their creed, and stressed the importance to all Christians of professing the same faith. The following Novel, of which five chapters have been translated by the Slavic canonist, deals again with an eminently ecclesiastical matter: the organisation of monastic life. In the preface to Novel CXXXVII which deals with regulating the creation and consecration of bishops and priests, Justinian expressed once more a similar idea to that in Novel VI: "If we try above all so hard to enforce the civil laws whose power God, in His love for mankind, has entrusted to us for the security of our subjects, how much more keenly should we not endeavour to enforce the canons and the divine laws which have been framed for the salvation of our souls." The same idea is repeated both in the original and in the Slavonic translation of chapter one of the Novel.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Sreznevskij, *op. cit.*, pp. 73 sq., 79, 84. *Corpus juris civilis*, III, pp. 409, 654 sq.; 593 sq. Benešević, *op. cit.*, pp. 748 sq., 757 sq., 764 sq.

<sup>19</sup> Sreznevskij, *op. cit.*, pp. 104 sq., 110 sq., 112, 113, 114, 126, 127; Greek original in *Corpus juris civilis*, III, pp. 18 sq., 381, 665, 666, 695 sq. The manuscript containing the translation of Efrem lacks the end of Novel CXXXVII. In Sreznevskij's edition it is completed from the mss. of Soloveckij which is a seventeenth century copy of Efrem's mss. A. V. Benešević in his edition combined the five novels with the collection of eighty-seven chapters, and, following a differing numbering of the mss. used, he calls this collection: Collection of Ninety-three Chapters (*op. cit.*, pp. 808 sq., 820, 822, 823). Novel CXXXVII is not reprinted



It should be stressed again that, although the *Nomocanon* of John Scholasticus was the first handbook of canon law with which the Russians of Kiev became acquainted, the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles* became more popular from the second half of the eleventh century onward, because of its more practical form. It is, therefore, all the more important to note that the compilers of the Russian Pilot's Books, although they gave preference to the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles*, nevertheless included in their works the collection of eighty-seven chapters with extracts from imperial novels, which they found in the *Nomocanon* of Scholasticus, and which until this day still form part of the printed *Kormčaja Kniga* — Pilot's Book — in use in the Russian Church.

From the foregoing it is permissible to assume that this collection of imperial novels must have exercised a marked influence in Kievan Russia. The principles which inspired the imperial decrees helped to mould Russian conceptions on the relations between Church and State and on the rights and duties of a ruler in a Christian community.

## V

Justinian's Novels were, however, not the only documents from which the Kievans could derive some ideas on Byzantine political philosophy. Similar ideas to those expressed in the Novels are scattered through the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles*, especially in the decrees of general councils, and of some local synods, and in addresses of the conciliar Fathers to the emperors. These texts have all been faithfully translated from the Greek original, and are contained in the Slavonic *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles*.

In this respect, some passages taken from the Acts of Oecumenical Councils are most illuminating. For example the canons approved by the Second Oecumenical Council (381) are preceded by a letter in which the conciliar Fathers announced to the Emperor Theodosius the Great, the results of their deliberations. It was translated into Slavonic, and reads as follows:<sup>20</sup>

"To the Emperor Theodosius, the most beloved by God, and the most pious, the holy synod of bishops assembled in Constantinople from different regions.

"At the beginning of our letter to your Piety, we thank God who instituted [manifested] the Tsardom of your Piety for the common peace of the

---

in Benešević's edition. Sreznevskij published it from the *Kormčaja* of Efrem, and from that of Novgorod.

<sup>20</sup> V. N. Benešević, *Drevne-slavjanskaja Kormčaja XIV titulov*, I (St. Petersburg, 1906), pp. 94 sq.

Churches and the confirmation of the valid faith, giving God the thanks we owe him. We report also, as we should [of necessity], to your Piety what was enacted by the Council. As we gathered, according to the letter of your Piety in Constantinople, we first renewed the mutual concord among us. . . .” After a short résumé of what has been accomplished during the Council, the Fathers continue:

“We thus ask your Clemency that the decree of the Council be ratified by letters of your Piety, in order that, as you have honored the Church by the letter through which you have convoked us, you may sanction what has been decided by your order [poveljeniem]. May the Lord confirm your Tsardom in peace and in justice [pravda], and may He let it endure for generations and generations. May he add to the earthly Tsardom the joy of the heavenly Tsardom. May God grant to the Universe, through the prayers of the Saints, to see you, who are really the Tsar, most beloved by God and most pious, in good health and abundant in all good things.”

These words express very clearly Byzantine ideas on the relations between Church and emperor. The ruler has been instituted by God in order to promote peace in the Church and to defend the true faith. It is the ruler's right and duty to take all measures for this purpose, and the bishops are obliged to follow his orders in this respect. Therefore it is in the interest of the Church to have a pious emperor and a steady government, uninterrupted by struggles for the succession, and it is the clergy's duty to pray for the good health and prosperity of the ruler.

The canons of the Third Oecumenical Council (431) are also introduced into the collection as having been decreed by a synod which was summoned by “an order [poveljenie] of the most pious Emperors.”<sup>21</sup> Once more the bishops declare that they gathered in Ephesus, because of the pious letter of the Emperor. The introductory words giving the name of the synod are also translated word for word into Slavonic: “Canons of two hundred holy Fathers who gathered in Ephesus on the order [the translator left the Greek word *ὑπαρεία* — *ypatia*]<sup>22</sup> of Flavius Valentinianus III and Theodosius Flavius II, eternal [*sic*] Augustus. . . .” The canons of the Fourth Oecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451)<sup>23</sup> are introduced in the same way: “Canons of 630 holy Fathers who gathered in Chalcedon on the order of Marcian the eternal Augustus.”

Besides the canons of the Council, the collection contains an extract

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 102. Cf. Mansi, vol. IV, col. 1469.

<sup>22</sup> The text given by Mansi, *loc. cit.*, has *ἐκ θεσπίσματος* and leaves out the names of the emperors.

<sup>23</sup> Benešević, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

from the fourth session which dealt with the affairs of the bishops of Tyre and Beirut. From the quotation it was clear to any reader of the Slavonic *Nomocanon* that the Council was presided over by the representatives of the Emperor who introduced each new item for discussion. The Slavonic translator renders the Greek word *ἀρχοντες* as "boljari," the name given to the members of the retinue of the princes in Kiev. In another passage he translates the same word with princes "knjazi." On a third occasion the word "boljari" is used for the senate (*σύγκλητος*) and the word "knjazi" for the *ἀρχοντες*.<sup>24</sup>

A very expressive definition of Byzantine ideas on kingship can be found in the letter addressed by the Council called *Trullanum* or *Quinisextum*, which was convoked by Justinian II in 691 in the imperial palace in Constantinople. The letter, with which the Fathers accompanied the canons voted by them and presented to the Emperor for confirmation was included in the collection of fourteen titles, and was translated word for word into Slavonic. Here is the most interesting passage:<sup>25</sup>

"Therefore when we were lazily going on in our lives . . . and when, because of our negligence, the foe and tempter of life attacked us . . . Christ, our God, who directs this greatest vessel of the present world, gave you to us as a wise priest, a pious Tsar, a true leader giving the right words in judgment, guarding the truth for eternity, dispensing judgment and justice throughout the earth, walking himself in life immune from any guilt. You whom wisdom had conceived and to whom she had rendered the service of a midwife, having educated you handsomely and adorned you with virtues and filled you with divine spirit, she revealed you as the eye of the Universe, illuminating all subjects with pure and clear intellect. To you God entrusted His Church, and He taught you to meditate on His law day and night for the perfection and edification of peoples who are under your hand. You supersede in your ardor for God the zeal of Phinehas, and, after piercing sin with the spear of your piety and prudence, you choose to save your sheep also from transgression.

"It was proper that he who obtained from above dominion over the human race should not only consider the things which concern himself and the direction of his own life, but should save men whom he rules from many fluctuations, seeking to deliver us from many sinful confusions and falls, as on all sides spirits of iniquity assail us perturbing our lowly bodies."

Bearing all this in mind and anxious to make good the failure of the two previous synods to give the Church good canons, Justinian, say the Fathers,

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 126, 129.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 132 sq. Mansi, vol. XI, cols. 929 sq.

“seeks to bring back the chosen people — like Christ who seeks in the mountains for the wandering sheep, to bring it back to its fold,” for he, Justinian, wants to preserve the laws and divine precepts by which we are given life after we have abandoned the dead deeds. After considering all that is necessary for salvations, and “after consulting God according to the dictum that they who seek God will find intelligence and justice, and they who really seek God will find peace; you [Justinian] have decreed [poveljel’ jesi] that this holy divinely chosen Universal Council shall assemble, in order that what is sought with great endeavor may, by unanimous consent and common agreement of the many, be put into effect by you. . . . Therefore, we beg your Piety, adding the voices of the Fathers who were previously gathered in this city, protected by God, by our Emperor Theodosius, of pious memory, that, as you have honored the Church by your letters of convocation, you may seal what has been decided by your pious signature. May the Lord stabilize your Tsardom in peace and justice, and may it be transmitted from generation to generation, and may He let [you] enjoy the heavenly Tsardom.”

It is not necessary to comment on this text. The main ideas of Byzantine political philosophy are clearly set out here by the representatives of the Byzantine Church: The Emperor is appointed by God as master of the Universe, he represents Christ on earth, his duty is not only to take care of earthly things, but above all, of heavenly things. Like Christ, he has to go after the strayed sheep — the heretics and sinners — and bring them back to the fold of the Church. The oriental and Hellenistic idea of the ruler — a good shepherd — appears here again in Christian garb. Justice, peace and philanthropy must distinguish his rule. As a representative of God, he has to take care of the Church, convoke the councils of bishops, confirm their decrees and enforce their application to the life of the faithful.

To these eloquent documents, impregnated with Byzantine ideas on kingship, and incorporated into canonical decisions of the oecumenical councils — the highest authority in the Eastern Church — may be added a few more, taken from the so-called Apostolic Canons and from the Acts of the first six local synods.

Among the canons, wrongly ascribed to the Apostles, Canon LXXXIII makes a very clear division between the priestly office and rank in the army or in the imperial administration.<sup>26</sup>

“A bishop, a priest or a deacon who has a position in the army and who wants to retain both a worldly rank and the ministry of the Church [stol’sko

<sup>26</sup> Benešević, *op. cit.*, p. 80. Cf. Mansi, *op. cit.*, vol. I, col. 46 (canon 82).

stroienie] should be deposed. What is Caesar's belongs to Caesar, what is God's belongs to God."

The following canon is even more pertinent:

"If anybody upbraids [censures] the Tsar or a prince without justification may he be punished. If he is a cleric may he be deposed; if he is a layman may he be excommunicated."

The Synod of Carthage (419) called to deal with the Donatists, several times invoked the help of the secular power in Church affairs:<sup>27</sup>

"It pleases us that a letter be given from our Synod to the African princes (k afrikiiskym knjezem) to ask, as it seemed, becoming help for the common Mother — the Catholic Church, in cases where the authority of the bishops in the cities is brought into contempt; that is that, with their princely authority, assiduity and Christian faith they should investigate what happened in all the towns in which the Maximianists had their churches, moreover that they take them away from them, nationalize them and make sure that secure knowledge of it be kept by all."

In another instance,<sup>28</sup> the Synod decided to request the assistance of the local governors for its legates when they were due to return from the emperor. They had to be given a military escort and material support on their journey. A third letter<sup>29</sup> sent to the imperial functionaries requested their assistance in bringing about the union with the schismatic Donatists.

## VI

The Slavonic translation deserves especial attention because of other additions to the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles* — the *Ecloga* and the *Procheiron*.<sup>30</sup> It should first be stressed that, although the Slavonic translation of the *Ecloga* which accompanies the translation of the *Fourteen Titles* is not made from the official edition of the imperial handbook, but from a version

<sup>27</sup> Benešević, *op. cit.*, p. 369.

<sup>28</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 400.

<sup>29</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 402.

<sup>30</sup> On the date of the Slavonic translation of both law handbooks see Saturník, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–33. The two documents were translated at the same time as the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles*. The translation of the *Ecloga* as now known was thus made after 950, most probably in Bulgaria. On the translation of the *Procheiron* see M. Benemanskij, *Zakon gradskij*, *op. cit.*, pp. 1–108. He admits the possibility that a translation of the *Ecloga* and of the *Procheiron* was originally included in the *Kormčaja* of Efrem, but was lost in the manuscript. He also analyses in detail all the parts of the *Procheiron* which were quoted in the *Nomocanons*. Cf. what V. V. Kačanovskij ("Slavjanskaja 'Kormčaja'," *Izvestija otd. russk. jazyka i slov.*, II [1897], pp. 1068–1108) says on the translation of both Byzantine law handbooks and on the new Slavonic translation of the *Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles* of the later "Photian" redaction, made in Serbia in the thirteenth century.

slightly changed by an unknown private jurist, and called *Ecloga privata*, it contains the famous introduction to the official edition.<sup>31</sup>

In this introduction the iconoclastic Emperor Leo III stressed very strongly the intimate relationship of things divine and human in the Christian Empire, and the emperors' divine vicariate on earth. The following passage expressed particularly clearly the Emperor's political ideas:<sup>32</sup>

"In the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Leo and Constantine the Faithful Emperors of the Romans.

"Our God the master and maker of all things who created man and granted him the privilege of free will [i počte ego samovlastiem], and gave a law in the words of prophecy to help him, and thereby made known all things which he should and should not do, so that he might choose the former as sponsors of salvation and eschew the latter as the cause of punishment; and not one of those who keep His commandments or who [except the weak] disregard them fails to receive the appropriate reward of his deeds. For it was God who declared both these things aforetime, and the power of His unalterable words, judging every man according to his deeds, will not, as the Gospel tells us, pass away.

"Since, therefore, having delivered to us the Sovereignty [deržavii] of the Empire [tsar'stvie], as it was His good pleasure, He added this thereto, to make manifest our love with fear toward Him in that He bade us, as He bade Peter, the supreme Head [starěštvie], of the Apostles, to feed His most faithful flock. We can conceive nothing more acceptable by way of thanksgiving to Him than the righteous and just government of those entrusted to us by Him, so that henceforward the bonds of wickedness may be broken, the unjust breaches of covenants may be crushed, and thus by victories over our enemies, through His almighty hand, we may be crowned with the encircling diadem, and our throne [tsar'stvo], wellbeing, and life may be confirmed, in many ways, honorable and peaceful."

Similar political ideas here can be traced to those in Justinian's Novels. The Emperor's sovereignty comes from God who appointed him in His Providence to rule over His faithful. The Emperor's position is sublime be-

<sup>31</sup> A critical edition of the Slavonic translation of the *Ecloga* and of the *Procheiron* is still one of the major desiderata of Slavonic philology. The only text available is that published in the first edition of the Russian *Kormčaja Kniga*, printed in 1650 in Moscow and revised by Patriarch Nikon in 1653. In these two editions the *Ecloga* is included in chapter I, and in all subsequent editions of the *Pilot's Book* in chapter XIX. The *Procheiron* is contained in chapter XLIX in the first two editions and in chapter XLVIII in all subsequent editions.

<sup>32</sup> Translation by E. H. Freshfield, *A Manual of Roman Law, the Ecloga* (Cambridge, 1926), pp. 66, 67. Original text reprinted from Zach. v. Lingenthal's edition by J. Zepos and P. Zepos, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 12, 13. I am following here Freshfield's translation indicating a few Slavic variants in this passage.

cause God has entrusted to him, as to the Apostle Peter, the care of His sheep. This definition of the imperial role indicates that it also includes some priestly functions: care for the true faith, the promotion of the Church's interests, and supervision of the clergy. Although not so clearly expressed as in Justinian's Novel VI, the necessity for harmony between the imperial and the spiritual powers is implied.

The introduction to the *Procheiron* also expresses some political ideas. It stresses principally the ruler's duty to be just and to provide a good legislation in accordance with God's law. It is curious to note that this introduction does not seem to have been translated into Slavonic. It is certainly not to be found in any manuscript containing the Slavonic text of the *Nomocanon*.

## VII

The collections of canon law, with the additions they contain, thus give a very clear and exhaustive idea of Byzantine political thought. They constitute the main source on which the Russians of Kiev could draw in order to enrich their own ideas on kingship and politics.<sup>33</sup> Besides the collections of canon law, there are also some other documents known to Kievan Russians, from at least the eleventh century on, which completely corroborate some of the information given by the official documents noted above.

Some interesting material is to be found in the so-called "Chains" — *catenae*. These were very popular in Byzantium from the fifth century on, and contain sayings of the Fathers and moral admonitions taken from their writings and from Holy Writ. It seems that "The Hundred Sayings," probably of Greek origin, and erroneously ascribed to the Patriarch Gennadius in the sixth century, became particularly popular in Kievan Russia. This collection, called *Stoslovec* by its translators and copyists, must have appeared in Slavonic at a very early period, because it is preserved in a manuscript dating from the eleventh century.<sup>34</sup> This manuscript contains first an exposition of the true faith and then a series of admonitions on the behavior of a Christian. After exhorting his reader in the fifteenth chapter "to restrain his mind with the fear of God as with a bridle," and "to keep watch upon himself every hour," the author urges him, in the following chapter, to fear all superiors, especially the princes:

"Incline thy head to everybody superior to thee. . . . Fear the prince

<sup>33</sup> On the influence of the Canon Law on the development of old Russian Law see N. Kalaiv, *O značenij Kormčej v sistemě drevnago russkago prava* (Moscow, 1850).

<sup>34</sup> A. I. Ponomarev, *Pamjatniki drevne-russkoj tserkovno-učitel'noj literatury* (Monuments of Old Russian Instructive Literature, 3 vols. [St. Petersburg, 1894-1897]), III, pp. XV, 1-16.

with all thy strength. . . . Learn from him how to fear God. . . . He who does not fear the earthly lord, how will he fear Him whom he does not see? . . . A pupil fears the master's stick, and all the more so, the master himself. So fear God and the ruler by whom the sinful are punished. For the prince is the servant of God for human mercy and punishment. . . . Before the prince, the deceitful person has fear with cause, and in submission to the prince he is to give faithful account, as to God Himself." In chapter twenty-three the author admonishes his reader to honor everybody who had been entrusted with an office by the ruler: "Those who have obtained power and fortune from their Tsar require glory also from their friends, and demand veneration from inferiors." In these words may be detected an echo of the Byzantine concept that the emperor is the representative of God on earth, and his living image, who should be honored and obeyed accordingly. St. Paul's teaching on rulers in chapter VIII of his Epistle to the Romans forms the basis of this speculation.

This passage of the *Stoslovec* is copied also in the *Izbornik* (Miscellany) of *Svjatoslav* dating from the year 1073.<sup>35</sup> This collection is another kind of "Chain" composed of moralising quotations from Fathers. It is of Bulgarian origin, and was copied for Prince Svjatoslav of Kiev. The compiler gathered a number of quotations from the Apostolic canons, from Theodoretus, Maximus and Olympiodorus in order to give the reader a true picture of a tyrant and to explain why the Lord suffers tyrants to rule: "A bad Tsar is not a true Tsar, but a tyrant. He is not sent by God, but elevated to rulership by men. When you see that a Tsar is unjust, then remember that it was not the Lord who gave him his distinction, but that he was put there by the people. The Creator of the Universe permits tyrants to rule for these reasons. This tyrant is a punishment sent by the Lord God, who, angered by the people's sins, permits a tyrant to rule over them."<sup>36</sup>

A quotation from St. John Chrysostom discusses Paul's declaration in the Epistle to the Romans (chap. VIII). Chrysostom explains that the Apostle's words should not be interpreted as if every ruler were sent by God. The words do not refer to any single ruler, but to rulership in general. Rulership is instituted by God, and is the work of His Providence. At the end the compiler exhorts his reader never "to tell a lie in the presence of a ruler. Beware of doing something sinful in the presence of a judge or a prince."<sup>37</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Published in the *Izdanie Obščestva ljubit. drevn. pis'mennosti* (Publications of the Society of Friends of Early Literature [Moscow, 1880]).

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 95-98.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 173 sq.



Another compilation of this kind is the *Izbornik of 1076*, which also bears the name of Svjatoslav, as it was written for him at his order. According to a recent theory, this work was composed, not in Bulgaria as it was previously thought, but in Russia.<sup>38</sup> This collection<sup>39</sup> starts with a meditation by a "teacher of wisdom" on the utility of frequent reading of books. Then follows an admonition by a father to his son.<sup>40</sup> The son must have been a princely official, because he is said to have been a frequent guest in the palace of the prince, and was able through his influence to reduce the punishments of condemned people. He is therefore exhorted not to listen to flattery, not to make a distinction between people, to respect the clergy in court, to be charitable, and by his charity to narrow the distance which separated him from his subordinates. It is a kind of mirror of a just princely official.

Then follows an admonition to the wealthy<sup>41</sup> to practice charity toward the poor and unfortunate. After a short exposition of the true faith, there follow the sayings of a *Stoslovec* which seem, however, different from those erroneously ascribed to the Patriarch Gennadius and quoted in the *Izbornik of 1073*.<sup>42</sup> One particular exhortation admonishes the wealthy to be always "adorned with justice, to love men of the same rank and to be gracious to men of inferior rank." It is surprising to find, among these admonitions to the wealthy, a definition of a true ruler which recalls the old Greek maxim, "The true ruler [vlastelin] is one who governs himself and is not a slave of his passions."<sup>43</sup>

In addition to these writings, the intellectuals of the early Kievan period could become acquainted with Byzantine political ideas by reading the Slavonic translation of the Chronicle, written in the ninth century by the monk George, who called himself Hamartolos — Sinner. This Chronicle was very popular in Byzantium and, in its Slavonic garb, reached Kiev from Bulgaria in the eleventh century.<sup>44</sup>

Of course, the chronicler did not intend to write a treatise on kingship. He was not even interested in the subject. Nevertheless, Slav readers could

<sup>38</sup> N. P. Popov, "L'Izbornik de 1076, dit de Svjatoslav, comme monument littéraire," *Revue des Etudes Slaves*, XIV (1934), pp. 5-25.

<sup>39</sup> V. Šimanovskij, *Izbornik Svjatoslava* (Warsaw, 1887).

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6a-23.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 24b-28b.

<sup>42</sup> See N. P. Popov, "Les auteurs de l'Izbornik de Svjatoslav de 1076," *Revue des Etudes Slaves*, XV (1935), pp. 210-228. The author thinks that the *Stoslovec* was composed by Ilarion of Kiev.

<sup>43</sup> Ed. Šimanovskij, pp. 24, 31.

<sup>44</sup> Ed. V. Istrin, *Knigy vremen'nyja . . . Georgija Mnicha*, I-III (St. Petersburg, 1920-30).

find in his narrative a few ideas on politics which were current in Byzantium, and which were a commonplace for every Byzantine of this period.

First of all, George the Monk shared the horror felt by all Byzantines for the anarchy which was identified in their minds with *δημοκρατία*, in other words, the rule of the people without a head man. The logical conclusion to be drawn from this is that they believed one man should rule. The monarchic principle was so well entrenched in Byzantine minds that the possibility of a different political system simply could not be imagined.

The *Chronicle of Hamartolos* on several occasions describes a tyrant or unjust ruler, and while describing the succession of Roman and Byzantine emperors, it gives, unintentionally of course, some indications of how the Roman system developed from a republic to a monarchy. It mentions that the monarchy retained, however, the principle of election of the princeps or emperor. This is of some importance for the Kievan polity, as will become apparent. The pre-eminent position of the Byzantine emperor in the Christian commonwealth was stressed also by George the Monk in his account of the convocation of councils.

## VIII

It was thus established that from the beginnings of Russian Christianity the Kievan clergy were in possession of this important material. From these documents they could learn the main ideas of Byzantine political belief. Accordingly, attempts must have been made by the clergy to introduce at least some of these ideas into Kievan political life. A short survey of some old Slavonic writings used or composed during the early Kievan period will show that the basic Byzantine ideas on the relationship between the Church and rulers, and on the rights and duties of rulers, were accepted by the Russians and put into practice from the end of the tenth century onward.

Primarily the Kievan Russians obtained from the collections of canon law, supplemented by imperial novels and law books, a clear conception of the sublime role of the Byzantine Emperors in human and Christian history. For, according to Byzantine beliefs, the emperors, not the patriarchs, were the representatives of God on earth, to whom God had entrusted the regulation of things divine and human. They were the supreme legislators for the Christian commonwealth, and the protectors of the Church.

This basic principle of Byzantine political theory was tacitly accepted when Kievan Russia became a Christian country. From then until the first half of the fifteenth century the Byzantine emperor's supreme position was respected by Russia.

The acknowledgment by the princes and people of Kiev of the supremacy of the emperor in the Christian commonwealth found its expression in the appointment of Kievan metropolitans. Every metropolitan had to be consecrated or invested by the patriarch of Constantinople and the patriarch's decision was then confirmed by the emperor.

Contrary to general belief the appointment of some metropolitans of Kiev by the grand princes themselves, did not indicate that the Kievan rulers had occasionally revolted against this interference of the patriarchs and emperors in the religious life of their country. There are some indications that a compromise may have been reached in this matter between Kiev and Constantinople, and that the metropolitans were chosen alternately by the patriarchs and the emperors who used to send to Kiev a Greek prelate, and by the grand princes, who used to choose a native priest.<sup>45</sup> If this supposition were to be fully substantiated, it would follow that only the confirmation of the new metropolitan had to be made by Constantinople. If a native priest was chosen by the princes, he had to seek the final approval of the patriarch and the emperor.

Because the main principles of the ecclesiastical legislation for the newly established Church in Kievan Russia were contained in collections of canon law obtained from Constantinople, and approved by the emperors, the function of the emperor, as supreme legislator for the Christian commonwealth, was tacitly acknowledged by the Russians. The Byzantines were satisfied with such an acknowledgment of the main principles of their political creed.

The fact that the Kievan State was so far distant from the Empire meant that the metropolitans of Kiev, especially prelates of Greek origin, exercised a beneficent influence on the quarreling princes, and prevented the rulers of Kiev from embarking on a policy similar to that followed by the Bulgarian and Serbian Tsars, who had attempted several times not to suppress the Basileus of Constantinople, but to put themselves in his place.

This submission of the Kievan princes to the supreme authority of the emperor cannot be compared with the relationship between vassals and sovereigns, as has sometimes been done by historians unfamiliar with the Byzantine political system.<sup>46</sup> The princes of Kiev were never vassals of the

<sup>45</sup> This problem deserves more thorough study. It was discussed by Dr. D. Obolensky, Reader in Russian and Balkan medieval History at Oxford, in a lecture given at Dumbarton Oaks, Harvard University, April 25, 1952.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. A. A. Vasiliev, "Was Old Russia a Vassal State of Byzantium?," *Speculum*, VII (1932), pp. 350 sq., and N. K. Chadwick, *The Beginnings of Russian History* (Cambridge, 1946), pp. 71 sq. See also S. H. Cross, "Medieval Russian Contacts with the West," *Speculum*, X (1935), p. 139, and F. Dvornik, "The Kiev State, and its Relations with Western Europe," in the *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. 4, vol. XXIX (London, 1947), p. 35.

emperor. They regarded him chiefly as the supreme authority on earth to whom every Christian had to submit in matters concerning the Christian commonwealth.

## IX

It was to be expected that the clergy, whether Greek or native under Greek tuition, would adapt Byzantine ideas on kingship to the primitive political thinking of Kiev. The leading principle of Eastern and Byzantine political philosophy was the belief that kings and princes were appointed not by the people, but by God. This principle was accepted fully in Kiev. At first it may seem unnecessary to stress this apparently self-evident fact, but, at the same time, the contradictory order of succession as it developed in Kiev before the country became Christian, and the role which the people often played in the succession to the throne, must be borne in mind. It was natural that the Greek and native clergy should enrich the customary Russian order with this idea, which the Byzantines inherited from Hellenistic political thinking.<sup>47</sup>

This principle is already fully developed and stressed in the *Primary Russian Chronicle*,<sup>48</sup> which received its definitive form at about 1111. The chronicler recalls that when Vladimir the Great hesitated to take energetic measures against bandits and robbers, for fear of committing a sin, the bishops reminded him "that he was appointed by God for the chastisement of malefactors and for the practice of mercy toward the righteous."

When speaking of Vladimir's death, the chronicler uses words which recall Hellenistic and Byzantine court style: <sup>49</sup> "When the people heard of this, they assembled in multitudes and mourned him, the boyars, as the defender of their country, the poor as their protector and benefactor. . . . He is the new Constantine of mighty Rome, who baptized himself, and his subjects; for the Prince of Rus imitated the acts of Constantine himself."

Further on, when reporting how Svjatopolk conceived the idea of killing all his brothers, and ruling alone, the author of the Chronicle exclaims:<sup>50</sup> "He schemed thus in his pride, being ignorant that God gives power to

<sup>47</sup> It is the author's intention to outline the history of this idea in his book on "The Origins of Christian Political Philosophy" now in preparation.

<sup>48</sup> See S. H. Cross, "The Russian Primary Chronicle," in *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, XII (1930), pp. 135; second edition by O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (Cambridge, Mass. 1953). Quotations are from Cross's translation, although the new edition of the document by Šachmatov in *Polnoe sobranie russk. ljet.*, 1923, 1926, 1927 should be consulted by specialists.

<sup>49</sup> S. H. Cross, *op. cit.*, pp. 210 sq., 213, 2nd ed., pp. 123, 124.

<sup>50</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 219, 2nd ed., p. 130.

whom He wills. For the Most High God appoints emperor and prince, and confers authority according to His desires.”

Then he reflects on the problem of why God sometimes permits an unworthy and sinful prince to rule: “Wherever a nation is justified before God, he there appoints a just emperor or prince, who loves law and righteousness, and sets up a governor and a judge to render judgment. For if the princes are righteous in the land, many sins are remitted. But if they are evil and deceitful, then God visits yet greater evil upon that country, for the prince is its head. Thus Isaiah said, ‘They have sinned from head to foot’ (Isaiah 1:6), meaning from the emperor down to the common people.” And the chronicler concludes his reasoning with another long quotation from Isaiah (3:1–4). The author of the most important Russian chronicle, which was to become a model for the chroniclers of coming generations, came thus to the same conclusion as did Byzantine political thinkers: God sometimes permits rightful kingship to degenerate into tyranny, in order to punish people for their sins.

The chronicler expresses similar ideas when describing how Izjaslav of Kiev, son of Jaroslav the Wise, lost the throne because, violating his solemn oath confirmed by kissing the Cross, he had cast his brother, Vseslav, into prison. “God thus revealed the power of the Cross, since Izjaslav violated his oath upon it when he took Vseslav prisoner. It was for that reason that God inspired the incursion of the pagans [the Cumans], and from this calamity the true Cross obviously delivered us . . . . God demonstrated the power of the Cross, as an admonition to the land of Rus that its people should not violate the true Cross, after sealing their oath by kissing it.”<sup>51</sup>

## X

In another particular the Kievans accepted an important principle of the Byzantine political system. As has been shown, the regulation of Church affairs was, for the Byzantines, one of the many prerogatives of the emperor as supreme legislator and representative of God on earth. The Kievan clergy willingly transferred this prerogative to the Prince of Kiev. This becomes evident from Vladimir’s first edict regulating the relations between the Church and the civil government – his *Tserkovnoj Ustav* – the Church Statute.<sup>52</sup> The text of the Statute as now known cannot date in its entirety

<sup>51</sup> *Russ. Prim. Chron.*, ed. Cross, 6576 (1068), p. 238, 2nd ed., p. 149.

<sup>52</sup> See the English translation by G. Vernadsky, “The Status of the Russian Church,” in the *Slavonic and East European Review*, XX (1941), pp. 305 sq. Cf. also W. K. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome* (Geneva, 1952), pp. 233 sq. The different editions in the original

from Vladimir's time — in the introduction Vladimir supposedly attributes his baptism to the Patriarch Photius, which is an anomaly<sup>53</sup> — yet there is no doubt that Vladimir is the author of the original version. This is also confirmed by one of his contemporaries, the Metropolitan of Kiev, Ilarion, who praised Vladimir's son Jaroslav for having enlarged the Statute given by his father.<sup>54</sup>

Without going into details concerning the several editions which the Statute underwent after 996, it suffices to stress two facts; that the Statute was published on the initiative of the Greek and Russian clergy in Kiev, and that it was based mostly on Byzantine legislation concerning the Church and its relation to the civil government.

Vladimir declares in the Statute that he decided to publish it after "he had opened the Greek *Nomocanon*." It is evident that the Greek *Nomocanon* was presented to Vladimir by the Greek prelates who asked him to regulate the affairs of the new Church according to the stipulations of Byzantine law. Ilarion mentions, in his praise of Vladimir, the Prince's frequent deliberations with the bishops in order to seek their advice on how the law should be kept by men newly acquainted with it.<sup>55</sup>

It is known that the Statute in both its short and extended versions contains some stipulations which do not correspond exactly to Byzantine imperial legislation.<sup>56</sup> Vladimir and his successor, Jaroslav, exempted not only the clergy and the monks from the jurisdiction of civil courts, but all persons dependent on the Church, or living in institutions founded by it. The exemption of ecclesiastics from the civil jurisdiction was confirmed by Justinian in his Code (*liber* I, *tit.* 3, *const.* 25,39; *tit.* 4, *const.* 13,29) and in his novels.<sup>57</sup> It seems, however, that even the extension of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over persons employed by and dependent on the Church was

in V. N. Benešević's work, *Sbornik pamjatnikov po istorii tserkovn. prava* (Collection of Documents concerning the History of Church Law), I (Petrograd, 1914), pp. 59–89.

<sup>53</sup> F. Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe* (London, 1949), pp. 65 sq., 176, 255 sq.

<sup>54</sup> See below, p. 104.

<sup>55</sup> See the quotation below, p. 104. Cf. also Valdenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 82–92.

<sup>56</sup> For details consult the *History of the Russian Church*, by the Metropolitan Makarij (*Istorija Russkoj Tserkvi*) 3rd. ed., vol. I (St. Petersburg, 1889), pp. 151 sq. Makarij's study of Vladimir's Statute still deserves the attention of specialists. For more details on this subject see Golubinskij, *Istoria Russkoj Tserkvi* (Moscow, 2nd ed., 1901), vol. I, 1, pp. 394–444.

Cf. also Ieromonach Nikolaj (Jarusevic), *Tserkovnyj Sud v Rossii do izdania Sobornago Uloženija Alekcēja Michajloviča* (1649 g.) (Petrograd, 1917), pp. 130–252, on the development of these practices in Russia from Vladimir's time to the middle of the seventeenth century.

<sup>57</sup> *Codex Justinianus*, ed. P. Krueger (*Corpus juris civilis*, II, Berlin, 1929), pp. 21, 25, 40, 45. *Novellae*, ed. G. Kroll (*ibid.*, III, 1928), for example, Nov. LXXIX, chap. 1, p. 333, Nov. LXXXIII, pp. 409 sq.

based on the interpretation of some constitutions of the same section of the Code (*liber. I, tit. 3, const. 28, 42, 46, 49*).<sup>58</sup> The stipulations contained in these constitutions were certainly too complicated for the newly established Russian courts, and it therefore seemed preferable to Vladimir and his advisers to simplify them by a sweeping extension of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

In one particular Vladimir's Statute differs from Byzantine custom. He ordered that law suits in which both ecclesiastical and civil interests were involved be directed conjointly by ecclesiastical and civil judges. According to Byzantine law there was no tribunal composed of ecclesiastical and civil judges. Such cases were to be decided by ecclesiastical or by civil authorities. But even this alteration of Byzantine practice in Kievan judicial procedure can perhaps be explained as a simplification of some chapters of Justinian's Novel CXXIII (chaps. 8, 21, 22)<sup>59</sup> in which the intervention of the bishop's tribunal and of civil magistrates is envisaged in certain cases. All these specifications in the Novel were undoubtedly too complicated for the primitive Kievan administration of justice, and were, therefore, apparently simplified by Vladimir.

Vladimir's decision that the bishops should be responsible for the preservation of the standard weights and measures can also be traced to Justinian's Novel CXXVIII. For although in chapter fifteen<sup>60</sup> of this Novel, Justinian charged civil magistrates with this duty, he stipulated that the standard weights and measures should be kept in the churches of the cities.

There is only one item in Vladimir's Church Statute which cannot be traced back to a Byzantine custom. This is the establishment of the tithe for the cathedral church of Kiev. The tithe was unknown in the primitive Church, and remained unknown in Byzantium. It is a Frankish invention, and was adopted by the early Western Church. Its introduction into Kiev is a certain indication that Western influences had penetrated Kievan Russia.<sup>61</sup> There is, however, no evidence that Vladimir extended this system over the whole of his State, as was the custom in the West. He ordered that

<sup>58</sup> *Cod. Justin., loc. cit.*, pp. 21, 28, 33, 34.

<sup>59</sup> *Loc. cit.*, pp. 601, 609 sq., 611.

<sup>60</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 641.

<sup>61</sup> On this subject see F. Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*, p. 255. It is possible that Western example influenced Vladimir in his extension of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The Byzantine missionaries agreed to it the more readily as it could be reconciled with Byzantine law and was favorable to Church interests. It should, however, be pointed out that the Russians might have become familiar with this custom through their relations with the Khazars. *Ibn-Khordadbeh*, ed. Le Goeje, *Bibl. Geogr. Arab.*, VI, p. 154, *Arabic text*, p. 115 sq. French translation states that Russian merchants traversing the Khazar State on their way to the East were asked to pay to the Khagan a tenth of the value of their merchandise (cf. also G. Vernadsky, *The Status of the Russian Church*, *loc. cit.*, p. 308).

only a tenth of his revenues be reserved as an endowment for the church of Our Lady which he had built. The acceptance of this practice by the Byzantine clergy, who predominated in Kiev in Vladimir's time, testifies to their readiness to accept native or imported customs, originally alien to them, if these customs did not impugn the interests of the Church.

Another Byzantine idea concerning the rights and duties of an emperor was also subconsciously accepted in Kievan Russia, and advocated by Ilarion. When describing how Vladimir introduced Christianity into his land, Ilarion extols the energetic way in which the Prince converted his subjects:<sup>62</sup>

"He issued an order to all his land to accept baptism in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, that the Holy Trinity should be glorified in all towns and all should become Christians — low and high, bondmen and free, those of low spirit and old, the rich and the poor. And there was no one who would resist his pious command, nor anyone who was not baptized out of love or out of fear of the command, since his piety was united with power. And at the same time, all our land praised Christ with the Father and the Holy Ghost."

The use of force by the emperors for the protection of the Church and for the spread of Christianity was claimed as a right by Byzantine emperors on the basis of their duties as representatives of God on earth, and was advocated by churchmen from the time of Constantine the Great. Constantine made use of this right against the schismatic Donatists and the heretical Arians. His son Constantius introduced, for the first time, some laws against pagans, although he abstained from enforcing them. These laws, with the addition of others, were included in the Code of Theodosius II and in the legislation of Justinian I. Russia thus accepted, from the beginning of its christianization, this Byzantine practice of protecting and extending Christianity.

Byzantine regulations concerning the election of bishops were also introduced into the Kievan State when it was first christianized. The election and confirmation of the metropolitan has been discussed, as has the fact that the prince played an important role in the selection of bishops, and often intervened directly in their appointment, a procedure not unknown in Byzantium. But the regular method for the appointment of new prelates was through election by the local clergy and citizens.<sup>63</sup> It seems, however,

<sup>62</sup> F. G. Kalugin, "Ilarion, mitropolit Kievskij i ego tserkovnoučitel'nyja proizvedenija" (Ilarion, Metropolitan of Kiev and his religious and didactic works), published in *Pamjatniki drevne-russk. učit. lit.*, I (St. Petersburg, 1894), pp. 70, 71.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. the remarks made on this subject by A. Pavlov in his book *Pervonačalnij slavjano-russkij Nomokanon* (The first Slavonic-Russian Nomocanon [Kazan, 1869]), pp. 6 sq.



that in this respect, the Kievans took as their guiding principle, chapter XXVIII<sup>64</sup> of the *Procheiron*, which was known in Kiev from the tenth or eleventh centuries onward. The Greek original says that "the clergy and the leading citizens of the city shall, in the presence of the Holy Gospels, elect three persons for presentation as bishops-elect." The Slavonic translator changed the text slightly. He added to the term "the clergy and the leading citizens" the words "and other citizens." He seems to have had in mind the city assemblies or *večes*, which played an important role in the Kievan State, and had their say even in the election of bishops.

When Justinian's view, in Novel VI, on the harmony which should always exist between the priesthood and the ruler is borne in mind, it is easy to understand why the Russian hierarchy gave priority to the maintenance of good relations with the ruling princes. It was not out of mere subservience to the rulers. The preservation of a harmonious relationship between the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium* was one of the leading principles of Byzantine political philosophy. It was stressed by Justinian, and its necessity was even more vividly perceived in Byzantium from the second half of the ninth century on, after the victory of orthodoxy over iconoclasm. This was the last great struggle between the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium* for the right of doctrinal definition, and this bitter experience enhanced in the minds of the Byzantines the importance, for the wellbeing of the commonwealth, of a firm understanding between the two powers. They were regarded by the Byzantines as the twin cornerstones on which the human race should build its political structure in order to secure its happy progress.

This principle is also stressed in the ninth century project for a law handbook which was called the *Epanagoge*. This was compiled by one of the two imperial committees which were charged by the Emperor Basil I to compose a law handbook to replace the *Ecloga*. Although the Emperor chose the *Procheiron*, the work of the other committee, as the official handbook, the *Epanagoge* continued to be used by Byzantine jurists as an important source of law.<sup>65</sup> Titles two and three of the *Epanagoge* define the functions of the emperor and of the patriarch, and in chapter eight of the third title, the following definition of the state is given:<sup>66</sup> "The state is composed, like man, of parts and members. The greatest and most important members

<sup>64</sup> Ed. J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *loc. cit.*, II, p. 182.

<sup>65</sup> Cf., on this document and its influence on Byzantine political thinking, the forthcoming book by F. Dvornik: *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, chap. VI.

<sup>66</sup> J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *Jus Graecoromanum* II, p. 242.

are the emperor and the patriarch. Therefore, the harmony in all things, and the symphony between the *imperium* and the *sacerdotium* will bring to the subjects spiritual and material peace and prosperity."

It is evident that the author of this definition was inspired by the introduction to Justinian's Novel VI quoted above. In the definition of the role of the patriarch, great stress is laid on his exclusive right to explain the decisions of councils. In the definition of the role of the emperor there is a manifest tendency to limit it in religious matters to the protection of the Church and the defense of true doctrine. The importance of this document on the evolution of Byzantine political speculation in the period following its publication is, however, often exaggerated.

It is possible that some of the Greek clergy who were sent to Kiev brought with them a copy of the *Epanagoge*, or that, knowing the definition of the roles of the emperor and the patriarch, they instructed the native clergy and the princes accordingly. But this is only a hypothesis which it would be difficult to substantiate. Some of the chapters of the two important titles of the *Epanagoge* were available from the fourteenth century onward in the translation of the *Syntagma*, but in old Slavonic only. The *Syntagma* was a handbook of canon law composed in alphabetical order by the Greek monk, Matthew Blastaris, in 1335. Blastaris incorporated into his *Syntagma* some chapters of the two titles of the *Epanagoge*. These can also be read in the Slavonic translation made in Serbia between the years 1349 and 1354.<sup>67</sup> The two titles were not widely known in Russia until the fifteenth century, and the *Epanagoge* was not translated into Russian until the sixteenth century.<sup>68</sup> It would thus be wrong to suggest that the political ideas expressed in the *Epanagoge* had any marked influence in Kiev. It should, however, be stressed that many of those ideas, especially that of the harmonious cooperation between the *imperium* and the *sacerdotium*, had already been expressed in Justinian's Novels, which were available to Kievan jurists and political thinkers in the Slavonic *Nomocanons*.

## XI

Besides the translation of Greek texts containing Byzantine ideas on politics, some original works in Slavonic written in Kiev can also be quoted.

<sup>67</sup> Edition by Stojan Novaković, *Matije Vlastara Sintagmat*, published by the Serbian Academy in the *Sbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskoga naroda*, od. I, book IV (Belgrade, 1907), pp. 127 sq. (chaps. 1, 2, 3, 5 [first part only] on the Tsar), 453 sq. (chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11 on the patriarch). In the Greek original ed. J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 240-243.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Valdenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 53 sq.

These betray the influence on their authors of ideas they had learned from Greek works translated into Slavonic. The most remarkable of such writings is the famous "Treatise on Law and Grace," composed by the Metropolitan of Kiev, Ilarion (Hilarion) about the middle of the eleventh century. In this document is to be found praise of the first Christian Prince, Vladimir, whose way of life illustrates the Metropolitan's ideas on kingship.

The treatise opens with a discussion of the plan of human salvation conceived by God's Providence. First the preparation for Christ's coming in Moses' Law and Jewish history, then its realization through the Saviour, the source of Grace. Russia was one of the last great nations to obtain its share of Grace, which it received from the first Christian ruler of Russia, St. Vladimir.<sup>69</sup> "With grateful voices the Roman land praises Peter and Paul, through whom it was induced to believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God; Asia and Ephesus, John the Theologian of Patmos; India, Thomas; Egypt, Mark — all these countries, cities and peoples, venerate and praise the teachers who instructed each of them in the orthodox faith. Let even we thus praise with modest paeans, our great, miraculous [man] who became our teacher and instructor, the great Khagan of our land — Vladimir."

With warm words Ilarion then praises the first Christian ruler of Rus. First of all he stresses Vladimir's sense of justice, and his fortitude and wisdom. These outstanding qualities of a prince were cultivated by Vladimir, says Ilarion, even before he became a Christian. Then he stresses Vladimir's piety, his zeal for the spread of the true faith, and his benevolence and charity toward the poor, sick and afflicted: "Giving to them that begged, clothing the naked, satisfying the famished and hungry, offering great consolation to the suffering, redeeming the indebted, and freeing the slaves. . . .<sup>70</sup> You were clad with justice, girded with fortitude, shod with truth, crowned with wisdom, and you adorned yourself with charity as with a precious trophy, and a golden ornament. O venerable head, you were the vesture of the naked, the nourisher of the hungry, the refreshment of the body for the thirsty; you were the helper of the widows, the sanctuary for the pilgrims, the protection for the unprotected, the champion of those who were hurt, and the enricher of the poor."<sup>71</sup>

Ilarion was thus, in Russia, the first to outline the vision of an ideal ruler. His vision reveals similarities to those in the treatises on kingship preserved from the Hellenistic and Byzantine periods which praised the

<sup>69</sup> F. G. Kalugin, "Ilarion, mitropolit Kievskij i ego tserkovnoučitel'nyja proizvedenija," *op. cit.*, pp. 59 sq.

<sup>70</sup> F. G. Kalugin, pp. 72, 73.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 75, 76.

king who was the benefactor of his people. Ilarion was, however, inspired more by Christian motives, especially by Christ's parable on the eight beatitudes, although he may also have been influenced by Byzantine views. This Byzantine influence seems to be indicated by a particularly telling passage in which the Metropolitan compares Vladimir with Constantine the Great:

"How much you should be praised, because you have not only confessed that Christ is the Son of God, but you have established the faith in this entire land. You have erected churches to Christ, and have guided His servants. You are similar to Constantine the Great, you are equally wise, and you love Christ as much, and therefore you equally deserve respect from His servants. Constantine, with the Holy Fathers of the Nicaean Council, established the law for men, and you, after deliberating often with our new Fathers, the bishops, have announced with much humility how the law should be kept by men newly acquainted with it. Whilst he established the kingdom of God among Greeks and Romans, you [accomplished something] similar, O praiseworthy one, because Christ is recognized as Tsar among them and among us, and whilst he, and his mother, Helena, brought the Cross from Jerusalem, and sending to all his empire, confirmed the faith, you again like them, brought the Cross from the new Jerusalem — the city of Constantinople — and after planting it in your land, confirmed [the faith]."

Not only is Vladimir quoted as the ideal ruler, but his son Jaroslav the Wise<sup>72</sup> is likewise mentioned: "A good witness [of your — Vladimir's — faith and zeal] is your son, George [Christian name of Jaroslav] whom God made to succeed after you as a ruler, because he has not swept away your law and order, but confirmed it, nor has he diminished the foundations of your faith, but has enlarged them. He has not demolished but built up, because he finished, as Solomon did with David, what you have left unfinished."<sup>73</sup>

Something more than praise of Jaroslav can be read in these words, for the prelate seems conscious of the importance of continuity in an established political order, stressing that Jaroslav not only respected the laws promulgated by his father, but confirmed them by adding new ordinances. Here

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 74.

<sup>73</sup> Werner Philipp, in his study *Ansätze zum geschichtlichen und politischen Denken im Kiewer Russland* (Breslau, 1940), p. 84, finds the phrase "finishing the unfinished" an echo of a Byzantine figure of speech used in the imperial chancellery in the composition of imperial letters. It is clear, however, from the quotations given by F. Dölger ("Die Kaiserurkunde der Byzantiner als Ausdruck ihrer politischen Anschauungen," *Historische Zeitschrift*, 159 [1939], p. 244), cited by Philipp, that this comparison is too farfetched. Ilarion has simply in mind that Jaroslav completed the construction of churches which Vladimir might have planned to build, as Solomon realized David's plans concerning the Temple.

Ilarion has in mind Vladimir's *Tserkovnoj Ustav* regulating the relations between Church and State in Kievan Russia, for these were naturally of great importance to the young Christian State.

The Byzantine idea of a harmonious relationship between the monarch and the representatives of the Church, so forcefully stressed by Ilarion, not only became his own guiding star, but had its effect on the evolution of Kievan Russia.

Ilarion's "Treatise on Law and Grace" impressed his contemporaries by the sublimity of its expression and the freshness and originality of its style, which was characterized by the frequent use of antithetical figures of speech, rhetorical repetitions, apostrophes, rhythmical accentuation of diction, and colorful parallels.<sup>74</sup> But beyond this it exercised a considerable influence on Russian writers of the periods following its own era. Manifest imitations of Ilarion's style are to be found in the letter sent by the Metropolitan Clement — called Smoljatič — to Foma, in which the author defends himself against accusations of relying more in his works on Homer, Plato and Aristotle, than on Holy Writ. It is the only letter of this important man, written after 1147, which has been preserved. Clement was one of the most famous preachers and writers of the twelfth century. Little of his literary work remains, but that which is extant reveals the strong stylistic influence of Ilarion, his predecessor in the See of Kiev. Another writer of the same period, the Metropolitan Daniel, was also inspired by Ilarion's writing.

Hagiographers of that and the succeeding periods generally followed the pattern outlined by Ilarion in his praise of Vladimir, for instance in: "Another Life of St. Vladimir," the "Life of Leontij of Rostov," "Lives of the Serbian Heroes, St. Symeon and St. Sava," the "Life of Dimitri Ivanovič," the "Life of Prince Constantine of Muromsk," the "Life of St. Euphrosine," the "Life of Prince Boris Alexandrovič" (written in the fifteenth century by the Monk Foma), the "Life of Procopius of Ustjog," the "Life of St. Stephen of Perm," the "Life of Prince Vsevolod of Novgorod," and the "Life of Niphontius of Novgorod."<sup>75</sup> Ilarion's style was also imitated by the author of the eulogy on Prince Vladimir Vasilkovič in the "Chronicle of Galicia and Volhynia," and it is reflected, too, in the first Ukrainian literary production of the seventeenth century.

The foregoing is important because it shows that later generations of

<sup>74</sup> On Ilarion's style see D. Tschizewskij (Czyzewskij), *Altrussische Literaturgeschichte im 11., 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1938), pp. 116-122, 407 sq.

<sup>75</sup> For details of bibliography and documentary evidence, see the study of A. Nikolskaja "Slovo metrop. Ilariona v pozdnejšej literaturnoj tradicii" (The Treatise of Metrop. Ilarion in the literary tradition of later periods), published in *Slavia* (Prague, 1928-1929), VI, pp. 549-563, 853-870.

intellectuals of the Kievan and Moscovite periods were also strongly influenced by the concepts so forcefully propounded by the patriotic Metropolitan. So it came about that Ilarion was responsible, more than any other Russian writer, for the fact that Byzantine ideas on harmonious relationships between Church and State, and on the right of princes to watch over the purity and integrity of the Church and to care for the respect of the priests, became a guiding star for the political and religious evolution of Russia for many centuries.

## XII

The intimate relationship between the Church and the secular power in Kiev is also stressed in the sermons of some prominent ecclesiastics of the early Kievan period. One of them, for example, Luke called Židjata, who died in 1059, apostrophizes the faithful in the following way:

“Fear God and revere the prince [Peter 2:17], be first servants of God and in the same way of the prince [rabi pervoe Boga takje gosudarja], respect with all your heart God’s priest and esteem also the Church’s servant.”<sup>76</sup>

In about 1072, the Monk Jakov sent a long epistle to Prince Izjaslav, whose Christian name was Dimitri, in which he exhorted the young ruler to follow God’s precepts and never abandon those guiding principles. He recommended, especially, clemency in dispensing justice. The cordial and frank tone of the letter, interspersed with quotations from Holy Writ, bears testimony to the intimate relationship existing between the Prince and the Church.<sup>77</sup>

Cyril, the Bishop of Turov, who died about 1190, seems in his sermons particularly to follow the pattern set by the Greek Fathers. His sermon “On the Council of the Holy Fathers,” praising the achievements of the Council of Nicaea (325) against the Arians, reveals clearly that the Russian prelate was well acquainted with Byzantine literature on the councils. The whole sermon is written in Byzantine fashion. At the end of the sermon he apostrophizes the Fathers of the Council as “terrestrial angels,” inviting them to approach God’s throne and “to ask earnestly for peace for the whole

<sup>76</sup> Ed. by I. E. Evsjeev in *Pamjatniki drevno-russkoj tserkovno-učitel’noj literatury* (Monuments of Early Russian Ecclesiastical-Instructional Literature [St. Petersburg, 1894]), I, p. 16.

<sup>77</sup> The letter was republished by Makarij in his *Istorija Russkoj Tserkvi*, II, pp. 303–306 (1st ed. 1845), pp. 324–327 (3rd ed. 1888–1889). A better version of this letter, however, was published by Valdenberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 101 sq., from a sixteenth century *Sbornik No. 1294* kept in the Imperial Public Library.

world, and for the corporal health of our pious princes" (knjazim našim; in one manuscript tsarju našemu).<sup>78</sup>

It was Cyril's pious habit, and probably that of most of the preachers in Kievan Russia, to terminate his sermon with a prayer for the bodily health and eternal salvation of the prince. Such a prayer can be read at the end of Cyril's sermon on Christ's Ascension.<sup>79</sup> A particularly eloquent prayer for the prince and the faithful terminates his sermon on the third Sunday after Easter.<sup>80</sup> In another sermon Cyril described the respect and veneration with which a letter sent by a prince is received and read. No one inquires about the character and qualities of the messenger "if he is rich or poor, if he is a sinner or a just man." Everyone listens most attentively to the letter when it is read, and if somebody does not understand a part of the message while it is being read he asks his neighbors for an explanation, but no one dares to interrupt the reading with noisy behavior. If the message of an earthly prince is received with such honor, with what attention should God's word be received, and how reverently should the faithful behave in the church when listening to it.<sup>81</sup>

On another occasion, Cyril recommended especially to rulers the love of justice, because God can deprive an unjust ruler of his dominion. Everyone should obey God's commandments and none who trespasses against them will be spared by Him.<sup>82</sup>

Cyril seems to have read the description of a good ruler contained in the Romance of Barlaam and Joasaph, which appears to be principally concerned with the short Greek treatise on ideal kingship presented to the Emperor Justinian by the deacon Agapetus in the sixth century.<sup>83</sup> The Slavonic translation of this Romance, made in the twelfth century in the Kievan State,<sup>84</sup> contains these interpolations, and the intellectuals of Kiev

<sup>78</sup> The quotation is from the edition of Cyril's sermons by A. I. Ponomarev, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 126-173, the quotation on p. 172. On Cyril of Turov cf. also Werner Philipp, *Ansätze*, *op. cit.*, pp. 35 sq., 40 sq., with more complete bibliography.

<sup>79</sup> Ponomarev, *ibid.*, p. 166.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 150.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 175, 176. Cyril probably has in mind a message sent by the prince to the *veče* or city assembly.

<sup>82</sup> K. Kalajdovič, *Pamjatniki rossijskoj slovesnosti XII veka* (Moscow, 1821), p. 144 (Parable on the human soul and body).

<sup>83</sup> The Greek text of Agapetus' treatise in Migne, *P.G.*, vol. 86, cols. 1163-1186. The Greek text of the romance in J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, IV (Paris, 1829-1832). Extracts from Agapetus, *ibid.*, pp. 331 sq.

<sup>84</sup> A facsimile edition of the Slavonic translation in *Obščestvo ljubitelej drevnej pis'mennosti*, 88 (1887), pp. 447 sq. For a study of the miniatures of this manuscript see S. Der Nersessian, *L'illustration du Roman de Barlaam et Joasaph* (Paris, 1937).

were thus given a new opportunity to acquaint themselves with the main ideas on kingship then current in Byzantium.

So far quotations from this description of an ideal ruler contained in the Romance have not been traced in Kievan literary documents known today, but Cyril of Turov made use of Barlaam and Joasaph in his Address to Basil (Vasilij), Abbot of the Monastery of the Caves in Kiev. He had read in the Romance the following passage which its author had taken from Agapetus (chapter 18): "And truth was attained by him [the king] who was adorned with the wreath of wisdom, and arrayed with the purple robe of justice," and Cyril applied this saying, in a slightly modified fashion, to the monks as follows: "But they are adorned with the wreath of wisdom, and arrayed with the purple robe of justice."<sup>85</sup>

### XIII

The Romance of Barlaam and Joasaph was not the only literary document from which the Kievans could have derived some additional ideas concerning the Byzantine theory of kingship. In the late twelfth century one of the Byzantine anthologies, known under the name of Μέλισσα (Bee, *Pčela*) was translated into old Slavonic,<sup>86</sup> and this compilation of quotations from Greek philosophers, Fathers, and Holy Writ, contained a wealth of important material, from which the Kievans were able to enrich their knowledge on the political ideas of the Greeks and Byzantines. In the collection of sayings on justice, besides quotations from Holy Writ and from several Fathers, especially Basil, John Chrysostom, and Cyril, there may also be found definitions ascribed to Plato, King Philip, Demosthenes, Hyperides, Socrates, Pythagoras, Zeno and Menander.<sup>87</sup> Even more informative are the sayings collected in the chapter "On authority [rule], and kingship" — *Slovo o vlasti i knjazenii*.<sup>88</sup> This contains a long definition of a good king, ascribed to John Chrysostom, which is a Christian version of a Greek and Hellenistic study of the ideal philosopher-king. It starts with the following words: "This is a true king who masters scorn and envy, and does everything according to

<sup>85</sup> See for details the well written and amply documented study by I. Ševčenko, "A Neglected Byzantine Source of Muscovite Political Ideology," *Harvard Slavic Studies*, 2 (1954), pp. 148–150. Cyril's text in K. Kalajdovič's *Pamjatniki*, *op. cit.*, p. 123. Agapetus' text, *P.G.*, vol. 86, col. 1169. Cf. Boissonade, IV, p. 310. Slavonic translation, *op. cit.*, p. 449.

<sup>86</sup> V. Semenov, *Drevnaja russkaja Pčela po pergamenomu spisku in Sbornik otd. russk. jaz. i slov. imp. Akad. Nauk*, vol. 54, 4 (1893). On the date of the translation, cf. M. N. Speranskij, *Perevodnye sborniki izrečenij v slavjano-russkoj pis'mennosti. Issledovanie i teksty* (Moscow, 1904), pp. 305 sq. Cf. also Ševčenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 143 sq.

<sup>87</sup> Ed. Semenov, *op. cit.*, pp. 47–53.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 96 sq.



God's law, keeping his intellect free and not allowing his soul to be dominated by sensuality. Such a man I would gladly call tsar of land and sea, and cities and soldiers."<sup>89</sup>

Another saying attributed to Philo in the Greek text and in the Slavonic translation,<sup>90</sup> is actually a copy of a chapter from Agapetus' treatise<sup>91</sup> which starts with the words: "God needs no one, but the Tsar needs only God. Therefore if you will do what is good, imitate Him who needs no one."

Besides this quotation, utterances on rulership attributed to the historian Dion, to Clitarchus, Euripides, Alexander and Aristotle, are to be found there also. Included too are a long quotation from Isocrates' panegyric on Nicocles, and, among other short sayings towards the end of the chapter, an interesting quotation from chapter XXI of Agapetus' treatise on kingship.<sup>92</sup> This quotation is of particular interest: "The Tsar is equal through the substance of his body to any man, but through the dignity of power he is similar to God the sublime. As he has on earth no one who is more sublime than he, it behooves him not to be proud, because he is human, and not to be wrathful, because he is like to God. Although honored by being the image of God, he is [also] composed of the image of dust, and thus he is taught to show simplicity to everybody."<sup>93</sup>

Several other quotations from the Slavonic Bee could be mentioned which gave the Kievans further insight into Byzantine and Greek political speculation. Other similar collections originated in Kievan Russia based on the *Pčela*. One of the most interesting of these literary products is the *Merilo pravednoe* — the Measure of Justice — containing didactic and moralistic texts with a juridical tendency as well as a selection of chapters on kingship from the *Pčela*.<sup>94</sup>

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 97, 98.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 100. J. F. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, I (1829), p. 45, had already attributed this saying to Agapetus.

<sup>91</sup> *P.G.*, vol. 86, col. 1184 (chap. 63). The Greek text used by the Slavonic translator is only slightly different from Agapetus' text.

<sup>92</sup> *P.G.*, vol. 86, col. 1172.

<sup>93</sup> Semenov, *op. cit.*, pp. 111, 112.

<sup>94</sup> M. N. Speranskij, *Perevodnye sborniki izrečenij v slavjano-russkoj piš'mennosti. Issledovanie i teksty* (Moscow, 1904), pp. 54 sq. (teksty). Speranskij's long study appeared first in *Čtenija v imp. obšč. istorii i drev. ross. pri Mosk. Univ.*, vols. 199 (1901), 212 (1905), 213 (1905). The pagination is the same. Speranskij, *ibid.*, pp. 305, sq. 329, discussed also the problem of the translation of the Greek Melissa into old Slavonic. He came to the conclusion that the translation was made in Kievan Russia, at the end of the twelfth or at the beginning of the thirteenth century. However, because, as we shall see, a passage of the *Pčela* was used in the description of the murder of Andrew Bogoljubskij (1175), we should date the translation before that year.

## XIV

This didactic material, revealing such great interest in political theory, was at the disposal of Russian intellectuals from the later Kievan period onward. Furthermore, at the beginning of the twelfth century considerable progress in political theory was made in Kiev thanks to the writing of a native Greek prelate, Nicephorus, who was appointed Metropolitan of Kiev (1104–1121) by the Patriarch of Constantinople. In his address to the Grand Prince of Kiev, Vladimir II Monomach (1113–1125), grandson of the Emperor Constantine Monomachus, the Greek prelate stressed, for the first time, an idea which was destined to become of the greatest importance for the further evolution of Russia. When calling the Grand Prince “Our valiant head, and [head] of all the Christian land,”<sup>95</sup> he implied that there should always be not only one Church in Russia, but that the country should be subject also to only one ruler, who should represent national unity and defend the indivisibility of the Church and the purity of her doctrine.

In the same passage, Nicephorus stresses two monarchic ideas — the choice of the prince by God, and his predestination to rule by a right acquired through his birth: “You, whom God had from far off predestined and indicated, whom [He] had sanctified and anointed from the womb, when intermingling the imperial and the princely blood.” In the eyes of the Greek prelate Vladimir II Monomach was the better fitted to rule as he was the son of a Byzantine princess and a Russian prince. Byzantine contemporary ideas on kingship are here forcibly expressed.

A Byzantine pattern is revealed also in the prelate’s counsels on the behavior of a Christian prince. But Nicephorus goes even further, for there seems to be no doubt that he was directly inspired in his admonition by Plato’s ideas as expounded in the *Republic*.<sup>96</sup> Plato’s comparison of the soul with the State is echoed in Nicephorus’ dictum that the five senses should act as the soul’s obedient servants in her contact with the world. Plato’s demand (*Republic* No. 443) that the three faculties of the soul should work in harmony is reflected in Nicephorus’ advice that men should also keep their senses under control so as to assure their harmonious service to the soul. Nicephorus also followed Plato in applying this comparison to the State. Above all the prince should scrutinize thoroughly all he hears

<sup>95</sup> The best edition of Nicephorus’ letter is still that published in 1815 (“Poslanie Nikifora Mitropolita Kievskago k vel. Kn. Volodimiru,” *Ruskija dostopamjatnosti*, vol. I, no. III [Moscow, 1815], pp. 61–75. The passage in question is on p. 63).

<sup>96</sup> Cf. M. N. Šachmatov — D. Čyževskij, “Platon v drevnej Rusi,” *Zapiski of the Russkoe archeolog. Obščestvo* (Prague, 1930), pp. 68 sq.

about others from his councillors and other men; otherwise he can do great injustice to some of his subjects by acting hastily without having ascertained whether accusations launched against them were well founded. Justice is the foundation of the State, says Plato, and the same virtue, exclaims Nicephorus, should be the most prominent ornament of a Christian prince:

“As concerns the hearing, my Prince, we cannot [directly] comprehend if that [which we hear] is well founded. It seems to me that, because you cannot all [see and] do [accordingly] through your eyes, those who are your instrument and who advise you apparently wrong your soul; but, because the ear is open, the arrow can pierce you only through it. . . . Think this over my Prince, and bear well in mind the men [whom] you have chased away, the men you have condemned in order to punish them, the men you have exiled; keep them all in mind, those who reported evil against someone [to you] and who falsely accused someone, and decide such cases by yourself. Because you are instituted by God to take care of all, act accordingly and forgive that you too may be forgiven, pardon that you may be pardoned. . . . In this way, having God in mind, you will be blessed if you defend justice and if you always give just judgment. If you act in this way you will build a house of spiritual salvation, and you will not build in vain. In this way you will keep intact the city which is your soul and you will not keep watch in vain. In this way you will destroy in it the bad advisers, any wily designers.”

After having once more exhorted the Prince to reconsider his verdicts and to be inclined to pardon, he continues: “Like a light in the world, because you possess the living word, are your deeds which are piety, justice, impartial sentences, mercy and forgiveness, and looking towards the Church of the triumphant and to the Prince of Princes . . . . And to sing with understanding [the Psalm] ‘I will sing of loving kindness and justice unto Thee, O Lord’ [Ps. 101:1] and this [Psalm] is a true reproduction of an [ideal] picture of a Tsar and Prince.”

It is easy to see in “this mirror of a good prince” the image of an ideal ruler like those to be found in the literature of the ancient civilizations of the Near East. The Psalm quoted by Nicephorus is one of the royal Psalms, and was probably composed for the ceremony of inauguration of a new Israelite ruler. The King promises Jehovah to be a just ruler, mindful of all his precepts. Nicephorus must have had this Psalm in mind when admonishing the Prince not to listen to slanderers. The same picture of an ideal ruler is to be found in the definitions of a philosopher-king and perfect citizen given by Greek political thinkers. These ideas, echoed in Nicephorus’ letter, were further developed during the Hellenistic period, and were then adapted

by Byzantium for the teaching of the Christian faith, and correspondingly enriched.

In another passage Nicephorus adds to the picture of an ideal Russian ruler another quality which was specifically Byzantine — the defense of the true faith. When exhorting the Prince always to be full of zeal for God, he specifies the manner in which he should manifest his zeal for God's interest: "When you do not permit the wolf to invade the herd of Christ, when you do not allow the vineyard which was planted by God to be overgrown by weeds, and when you observe the tradition of your fathers."<sup>97</sup> In another letter to the Prince, the Metropolitan warned him against the errors of the Latins.

## XV

Nicephorus tried to inculcate his ideas on good kingship upon Vladimir II Monomach of Kiev, and his admonitions certainly bore fruit. Vladimir Monomach became a kind of ideal Christian prince in Russian ecclesiastical tradition, and used to be held up for emulation by other princes. In their admonitions to Monomach's successors and to other princes, the ecclesiastics could recommend the reading of Monomach's *Poučenie*,<sup>98</sup> a kind of testament which he left to his sons and in which he showed how he had tried to realize his ideal of good kingship during his life.

There is a certain connection between Nicephorus' admonitions and Monomach's description of his endeavors to be a good ruler. Monomach was not a theorist, there are in his work no abstract contemplations on the duties of a ruler, nothing to remind the reader of a Byzantine treatise on rulership, or of a western example of a good prince, but in his description of his deeds is discernible the attempt to realize all the theoretical expositions given to him by the learned Greek Metropolitan.<sup>99</sup>

The admonitions are interspersed with quotations from the Psalms, from St. Basil, and from Holy Writ, and by detailed accounts of some of Monomach's deeds as a warrior and hunter. These are meant to illustrate the general exhortations to his sons to be good rulers. Many of these admonitions could have been given by any Christian father to his sons. Monomach was,

<sup>97</sup> *Poslanie*, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

<sup>98</sup> I. M. Ivakin, *Knjaz Vladimir Monomach i ego Poučenie* (Moscow, 1901). The *Poučenie* is preserved at the end of the Laurentian manuscript of the Russian Primary Chronicle. See Cross's translation in the new edition of the Chronicle by O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *op. cit.*, pp. 207–215.

<sup>99</sup> Werner Philipp (*op. cit.*, p. 87) discerned this connection well: "Ihr Verhältnis zu einander lässt sich dahin charakterisieren, dass das Schreiben des Metropoliten die Grundsätze entwickelt, deren Anwendung im Einzelnen die Unterweisung Vladimirs bringt."

however, fully conscious of the fact that the general Christian principles should be observed first of all by those who had been appointed by God as rulers. Some passages revealing Monomach's main ideas deserve quotation:

"According to the word of the Gospel, learn to govern your eyes, to curb your tongue, to moderate your temper, to subdue your body, to restrain your wrath, and to cherish pure thoughts, exerting yourself in good for the Lord's sake. When robbed, avenge not; when hated or persecuted, endure; when affronted, pray. Destroy sin, free the oppressed, render justice to the orphan, protect the widow."<sup>100</sup> This is a description of the Greek superlative man-philosopher in Christian terms.

Good relations between the Throne and the Altar are recommended in the following words: "Receive with affection the blessings of bishops, priests, and priors, and shun them not, but rather, according to your means, love and help them, that you may receive from them their intercession in the presence of God."

The ruler should be careful in making covenants and treaties, but having concluded one, he must keep his word: "Whenever you kiss the Cross to confirm an oath made to your brethren or to any other man, first test your heart as to whether you can abide by your word, then kiss the Cross, and having given your oath once, abide by it, lest you destroy your soul by its violation."

Moreover, a ruler should be a good administrator of his realm, and a good general: "Be not lax in the discipline of your homes, but rather attend to all matters yourselves. Rely not upon your steward or your servant, lest they who visit you ridicule your house and table. When you set out to war, be not inactive, depend not upon your captains, nor waste your time in drinking, eating, or sleeping. Post the sentries yourself, and take your rest only after you have posted them at night at every important point around your troops; then take your rest, but arise early. Do not put off your accoutrements without a quick glance about you, for a man may thus perish suddenly through his own carelessness."<sup>101</sup>

It will have been noted that the Metropolitan Nicephorus, when addressing Monomach as "head of all the Christian land," manifested his sympathies for a monarchic regime in Kievan Russia. This was natural for a Byzantine who did not know any other regime than a monarchy. In the Kievan State the Greek clergy had to accommodate themselves to the native custom of dividing the realm among the members of the Rurik dynasty under the nominal leadership of the Prince of Kiev, its oldest member. But the clergy

<sup>100</sup> Cross' translation, *op. cit.*, pp. 303 sq., ed. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, p. 208.

<sup>101</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 305, ed. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, p. 210.

succeeded at least in maintaining the unity of the Church under the Metropolitan of Kiev. The Greek prelates and their native disciples tried to apply as many Byzantine political principles as possible to the chiefs of the numerous principalities,<sup>102</sup> but the unity of the "Lands of the Rus" remained their ideal, and whenever they found a prince who seemed capable of realizing this ideal, they hastened to offer him their support.

This clerical support was an immeasurable asset for the successors of Ivan Kalita of Moscow. It helped them to realize this old Kievan ideal in the Moscovite period of Russian history. Such tendencies manifested themselves also in the later Kievan period when the disintegration of the Kievan State into numerous quasi-independent principalities began to threaten the future of the Nation. Monomach was one of the last Kievan Princes who was able more or less to assert his authority over Rus and defend it against the numerous incursions of the Cumans who had appeared in the steppes of Southern Russia and cut off Kiev from access to the sea. Because of this he was hailed as an ideal ruler after Vladimir.

## XVI

It is characteristic that the other prince who found warm support from the clergy and who was hailed as a most able ruler was Andrew Bogoljubski, Prince of Suzdal-Vladimir, the first prince who had tried to introduce an autocratic regime in his principality and to extend it also over Kiev when he became master of the city. Andrew's autocratic regime was premature and too alien to the democratic traditions that had prevailed hitherto in Kievan Russia. Finally he had to pay with his life for his intransigent and despotic policy. He was assassinated by the discontented princes — his relatives — and boyars in 1175.

Andrew, however, was a great benefactor of the Church in his principality, and was a genuinely pious man. This circumstance won him much sympathy among the clergy. Cyril, Bishop of Turov, one of the most prominent writers of the twelfth century, was in close and friendly touch with Andrew. This was certainly characteristic of Andrew's influence for Cyril was among those churchmen who vigorously opposed Andrew's vain attempt to erect an independent metropolis in Vladimir.

Andrew did not hide his intention to be master over his clergy, as is illustrated by his dismissal of Leo, Bishop of Suzdal, because the Bishop's opinion

<sup>102</sup> It is significant to note that in the political literature of the Kievan period no attention is paid to the role which the democratic *večes* — city assemblies — had played in Kiev and in other principalities. Cf. J. Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia* (New Haven, 1948), p. 289.

differed from the Prince's own on the subject of fasting. Yet the author of the Laurentian Chronicle viewed his reign very favorably.<sup>103</sup> When commenting on his violent death (1175) he calls him, in Byzantine fashion, an orthodox and Christ-loving Prince, who from his youth loved to follow Christ and his most chaste Mother . . . , who beautified his soul, like a splendid palace, with excellent virtues." He compares Andrew several times with King Solomon, and praises him because he followed the example of David in repentance. He describes his assassination in great detail, as if it were a martyr's death, and asks the deceased Prince to intercede in heaven for his people, and "the Russian Land." At the end of his long and detailed description of Andrew's death, the chronicler exclaims: "The Apostle Paul writes: 'Every soul should be subject to powers, because the powers are instituted by God.' For the Tsar, in his earthly nature is similar to any other man, but, because of his power, he is of great dignity — like God. The great Chrysostom says: 'He who opposes the power, opposes the law of God. The Prince does not bear the sword in vain, for he is the servant of God.'"

In this passage may be discerned the main sources of Kievan political doctrine as the Russian clergy had derived it from Byzantine inspiration: the Old Testament with the example of Kings David and Solomon — the New Testament especially the famous passage in St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans (chap. 13:1–4), and the writings of the Holy Fathers in particular of John Chrysostom. On the other hand, never before in the Kievan period has the power of a prince been exalted to such a degree as in this eulogy of the first Russian autocrat.

This eulogy of Andrew in the Laurentian Chronicle is the more interesting as it shows that the Russian clergy had learned well the political ideas they found in the literature available to them, besides Holy Writ and the writings of the Fathers, and that they knew how to propagate them. In this passage may be recognized the quotation from Agapetus' treatise in the Slavonic *Pčela*. The quotation from Chrysostom can also be traced to the twenty-third homily on Paul's Epistle to the Romans.<sup>104</sup> In this passage Chrysostom explains verses one to four of the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle. This part of the homily reads like a treatise on the origin of kingship, and on the importance of an authoritative power for human society. It is very significant that the author of the chronicle quoted Paul's words from

<sup>103</sup> *Polnoe sobranie russkikh ljetopisej*, vol. I, 1st ed. (1846), pp. 156 sq., vol. I, 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1927), p. 370.

<sup>104</sup> Migne, *P.G.*, vol. 60, cols. 615, 616. W. K. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome*, p. 57, follows the customary interpretation and attributes the whole passage to Chrysostom. However, in none of his homilies does Chrysostom compare the earthly prince with God. Cf. I. Ševčenko, *loc. cit.*, p. 142.

this homily. He must have been familiar with it, and must have shared Chrysostom's views in this matter.

This eulogy on Andrew was copied from the Laurentian Chronicle, or from its source through other chronicles. One of them — the *Ljetopisec Perejaslavlja Suzdal'skago* — introduced in the year 1186 another quotation from the *Pčela*, and this time indicated his source clearly.<sup>105</sup> This is another instance showing that the maxims contained in this collection were eagerly read and used by Kievan intellectuals.<sup>105a</sup> Some of them, however, found full application in political matters only during the Moscovite period.

## XVII

Before terminating this survey, attention should be drawn to a special feature in the Kievan political structure which becomes more understandable when seen from the Byzantine point of view. When studying the customs observed in the Kievan period at the enthronement of new rulers, many specialists have been puzzled by the lack of elaborate ceremonial, and by the insignificant role of the clergy. In this respect Kievan customs differ radically from the impressive coronation ceremonies which the Church introduced into all the courts of Western Europe.

The Russian Primary Chronicle in Laurentius' text pays no attention to the circumstances which might be expected to have accompanied the accession of the successors of Vladimir I. Its author seems anxious to stress only the hereditary right of succession. This is clear from the paucity of words with which he describes the accession to the throne of Kiev of Jaroslav, Izjaslav, Vsevolod and Vladimir: "Jaroslav established himself in Kiev upon the throne of his father and his grandfather. . . ." <sup>106</sup> "When the Grand Prince Jaroslav died, Izjaslav his son inherited his domain and settled in Kiev. . . . Izjaslav then took up his abode in Kiev." <sup>107</sup> "Vsevolod reigned

<sup>105</sup> K. M. Obolenskij, *Ljetopisec Perejaslavlja Suzdal'skago* (Moscow, 1851), p. 99. Cf. also Ševčenko, *loc. cit.*, pp. 143 sq.

<sup>105a</sup> M. V. Šachmatov, *Opyty po istorii drevne-russkich političeskich idej, I. Učeniya russkich ljetopisej domongoľ'skago perioda o gosudarstvennoj vlasti* (Prague, 1927), pp. 557–563, has collected some passages from Russian chronicles of the Kievan period which seem to be inspired by the chapter on rulership of the *Pčela*. Not all his quotations are convincing. Some parallels from the Laurentian and Hypatian Chronicles, dated from 1175 and after, could have been inspired by what the authors had read in the *Pčela*. Šachmatov tried to collect all passages in Kievan chronicles and other writings expressing ideas which are in some way related to any kind of political speculation. Unfortunately, the work — not printed, only reproduced from typewriting — is almost unusable because of the many divisions and subdivisions. Its author does not see the forest for the trees.

<sup>106</sup> *The Russian Primary Chronicle* 6524 (1016), trans. Cross, 2nd ed., p. 132.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 6559 (1051), p. 140, 6562 (1054), p. 143.



in Kiev on the throne of his father and his brother, after assuming the sovereignty over all Rus. . . .”<sup>108</sup> “Vladimir thus occupied the throne of his father and his uncle.”<sup>109</sup>

It appears, however, that the clergy attempted at an early date to endow the accession ceremonial with some religious practices in order better to express the generally accepted idea that the prince was chosen by God and that his power to govern came from above. The Hypatian (Ipatian) and Laurentian Chronicles report some of these attempts. The Hypatian Chronicle is the first to mention the presence of the clergy at the enthronement of a ruler. Its author describes the enthronement of Vladimir as follows:<sup>110</sup> “Vladimir Monomach appeared in Kiev on Sunday, and there the Metropolitan Nicephorus with the Bishop and all the Kievans came to receive him with great respect, and he sat on the throne of his father and of his grandfathers, and all the people were glad, and the insurrection abated.”

The beginning of the reign of Izjaslav, son of Mstislav, is described in a similar way:<sup>111</sup> “Thus Izjaslav, looking up to Heaven, and giving thanks to God and to the life-giving Cross for such help, entered Kiev with great glory and honor, and there came to meet him a great number of the nation, abbots with monks of the whole of Kiev in their vestments, and he entered the Holy Sophia and rendered homage to the Mother of God, and sat on the throne of his grandfather and of his father.” In his description of the assumption of power in Kiev by Iuri of the house of Monomach in 1149, the chronicler is very concise:<sup>112</sup> “Iuri thus entered Kiev, and a great number of people went to meet him with great joy, and he sat on the throne of his father, glorifying and honoring God.” In 1151<sup>113</sup> Vjačeslav “thus went to Kiev, and to the Holy Sophia, and sat on the throne of his grandfather and of his father.” When Iuri succeeded to the throne of Kiev for the second time, the chronicler is again very laconic:<sup>114</sup> “In this way Iuri, glorifying God, went to Kiev and a great multitude of people went to meet him, and he sat on the throne of his father and grandfather.”

It is puzzling for anyone accustomed to descriptions of the accession of western kings to find no mention of a coronation in these short descriptions. The part played by the clergy on such occasions was rather modest, being

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 6586 (1078), p. 167.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 6601 (1093), p. 175.

<sup>110</sup> *Polnoe sobranie russk. ljetop.*, vol. II (1845), 6621 (1113), p. 4: “Volodimir Monomach sjede Kiev, v nedjelju, usrjetoša že i mitropolit Nikifor s episkopy i so vsimi Kijane, s čest’ju velikoju, sjede na stolje ottsa svoego i djed svoich, i vsi ljud’e radi byša, i mjatež vleže.”

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 6654 (1146), p. 24.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 6657 (1149), p. 45. Cf. also Laurentian Chronicle of the same year.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 6659 (1151), p. 57.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 6663 (1155), p. 77.

limited to the salutation of the new ruler, perhaps to the presentation of the "life-giving Cross," which he kissed, and to accompanying him to the church of the Holy Wisdom where he bowed before the holy icons and where the official enthronement took place. On many other occasions of this kind the presence of the clergy is not even mentioned.

It is evident that the clergy had to content themselves with the simple practice which had developed in Kiev before the christianization of the country. Because the Byzantine practice of succession to the imperial throne originated in the old Roman practice and was based on strong secular traditions, the Greeks had no objections in principle to the native Kievan ideas. It was, however, to be expected that the clergy in Kiev would be anxious to permeate the simple practice with a deeper religious meaning, as did the Byzantine clergy. This tendency in Kiev becomes manifest again in the Suzdalian principality where an autocratic regime first made its appearance in Russia during the reign of Andrew Bogoljubskij. After Andrew's death, the state of anarchy which it provoked was brought to an end by his brother Vsevolod III. Vsevolod, however, continued his brother's autocratic regime, and ruled like an absolute monarch over the whole principality, imposing his sovereignty on Kiev and Novgorod as well. Because of this he found staunch supporters among the clergy, who were always ready to support a man strong enough to gather the lands of the Rus under his rule. One of the clergy, the author of the Laurentian Chronicle, a continuation of the Primary Russian Chronicle, has left an important description of an enthronement which shows how the clergy were endeavoring to give a more religious character to such ceremonies.

The restricted role of the Church can be detected in a description of how Vsevolod III sent his oldest son, Constantine, to rule at Novgorod, and of how he was received there. In the chronicler's description of the two ceremonies there is no trace of any kind of coronation or anointing of the new Novgorodian ruler. The part played by the Church is again limited, and the Grand Prince Vsevolod III is the main actor during the ceremony at Vladimir: <sup>115</sup> "His father presented him with the true Cross and a sword, saying: 'This [the Cross] will be your protector and helper, and the sword your menace [threat] and safeguard, which I hand over to you that you may protect your people from enemies.' And he said: 'My son Constantine, God has given thee the seniority over all thy brothers, and Novgorod the Great possesses [now] the seniority [right] to rule over all Russian lands, in thy name and to thy glory. But, it was God who gave thee the seniority among all

<sup>115</sup> *Polnoe sobr. russk. letop.*, vol. I (1846), 1714 (1206), pp. 177 sq.

thy brothers, and in all Russian lands. And I give [confirm] thee [the right of] seniority; go to thy city.' He kissed him and dismissed him."

There is no mention of a priest at this short ceremony, though it may be supposed that the Bishop of Vladimir and his clergy would hardly have been excluded from such an important political event. It was most probably the Bishop who presented the Cross to Vsevolod III. The fact that the chronicler mentions the celebration of the liturgy after the ceremony also suggests that the Bishop and the clergy were present. The handing over of the Cross and sword to Constantine was performed, however, by the Grand Prince, who stressed his own prerogative to confirm the right of seniority and rulership in his principality, in which he also included Novgorod, here already called "the Great."

The clergy did not participate prominently in the ceremony of the Prince's enthronement in Novgorod either: "There came to meet him, with the Cross, with great reverence, a great number of people from young to old, together with the Bishop Metropolitan. And there was great rejoicing in Novgorod, according to the words of the prophet David, who says: 'Come, let us rejoice in the Lord, kneel down before God, our Salvation [Ps. 94-95:1]. . . .' And when he arrived at the Church of the Holy Trinity and sat on the throne, they bowed before him, and greeted him with honor, as the prophet says: 'Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever. . . . Thou lovest justice and hatest iniquity, therefore God, thy God, has anointed thee. . . . He is thy God, and bow before Him' [Ps. 44-45:7, 8, 12]. And then he went to his dwelling, and after having offered hospitality to the men of Novgorod, he dismissed them with honor and then started to give judgment."

It is clear that the ceremony of the enthronement did not differ very much from those described in the Hypatian Chronicle. It is, however, interesting to see how the writer of the Laurentian Chronicle endeavors to endow the simple rite with a more venerable aspect by quoting passages from the Holy Scripture, stressing the sublime position of the ruler, and his intimate relationship with God, who gave him his kingdom. This is evident in the last quotation, which alludes to an anointment used in the elevation of Israelite kings. This tendency is even more pronounced in the quotations by which the author introduced his descriptions of the ceremony in Vladimir. The whole passage deserves to be quoted:

"There was a great rejoicing that day in Vladimir. As the prophet David says: [Ps. 117-118:24]: 'This is the day which the Lord hath made, let us rejoice and be glad in it.' And then he says [Ps. 20-21:1-5]: 'O Lord, the Tsar shall have joy in thy strength and he greatly rejoiced in the salvation.

Thou hast given him his heart's desire, and hast not withheld the request of his mouth. Thou hast placed a crown of precious stones on his head; he asked life of thee, and thou gavest him length of days for ever and ever.' And then [Ps. 2:7-9]: 'The Lord said unto me, "thou art My son, today I have begotten thee; ask of Me, and I will give thee the people of thy inheritance, and their possessions will reach the end of the earth; and thou shalt govern them with a rod of iron."' And then the Apostle says [Rom. 13:1-4]: 'World powers are ordained by God. We must fear the powers in order not to do evil and in order not to obtain afterwards punishment from them.' And concerning this he says: 'He is the servant [minister] of God, an avenger, for wrath to him that doeth evil. If thou wilt have no fear of the powers, do that which is good, and thou shalt be praised by them. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid, for he beareth not the sword in vain.' "

Other biblical texts, cited by the chronicler, after he had recalled the celebration of the liturgy, again exalt in Byzantine fashion, the role of the ruler as defender of his people, a philanthropist, a true benefactor (*εὐεργέτης*) of his subjects, ready to take care of the poor and the unfortunate. (Math. 25:4, 35, 36, 40; Ps. 111-112:5; Ps. 40-41:1, 2; II Cor. 9:6).

From all of this a rather clear picture can be obtained of the ideal ruler as conceived by the Russian clergy of the later Kievan period. It is Byzantine in pattern. In this respect the author of the chronicle is anxious to exalt the secular power, and to present the ruler as the representative of God on earth, acting as his minister. It is moreover evident that he supported the strong absolutist regime of the Suzdalian Princes.

It should be stressed that, despite the chronicler's attempt to give the ceremony a religious meaning, the role of the clergy at the ceremonies of accession to the throne, although more prominent than in Kiev, was still rather modest in the Suzdalian principality. They had no part in the election of the prince, nor in the confirmation of his right to rule. They are shown only confirming God's election of the prince, and giving him the Church's blessing. This also corresponds to the Byzantine custom. There the new emperor was elected by the Senate, and the army, or if designated as co-emperor, he was elected by the ruling Basileus, who also appointed his successor. The ceremony of the coronation never achieved in Byzantium the same importance it did in the West. The patriarch's role was limited to the blessing of the imperial vestments, and of the imperial diadem which the emperor placed on his own head or on that of his chosen co-emperor, and to liturgical prayers for the new ruler. The acclamation of the new ruler by the people after his election, which also played an important part in Byzantine imperial ceremony, is mentioned again in the ceremony of 1206. Like the Byzantine Church, the Russian Church was content with this modest role.

There is yet another matter in the chronicler's report, which deserves particular stress. Vsevolod III is said to have confirmed his eldest son's seniority by giving him the right to rule over the whole of Russia. These were not vain words. Vsevolod III was in truth master of the whole Suzdalian principality, for he had imposed his will on Novgorod, and, as Grand Prince of Kiev, he was recognized by the southern princes as senior ruler. It may be deduced from his words, that he really thought he ought to bring together all the Russian lands — a conception which became most important in the expansion of Moscovy — and that he should shift the political center of this new "Russia" to the North, to Vladimir. He had the blessing of the Russian Church for his deed.

It is true that the hopes Vsevolod held for Constantine were not fulfilled. He had to replace him in Novgorod first by his younger brother, George II, and then by Jaroslav, and the fragmentation of the Suzdalian territory which started under his sons and grandsons largely ruined his own work. His idea, however, survived. The connection of Vladimir with Novgorod was not completely interrupted. It was strengthened again when one of Vsevolod's grandsons, Alexander, was elected to become Prince of Novgorod. The victory over the Swedes, which Alexander won on the river Neva, won him the surname of Alexander Nevski, and, in the eyes of Russians, gave to the Suzdalian branch of the Ruriks another claim to political leadership in all Russian lands. It was the descendants of Alexander's son David, the creator of the Moscovite principality, who were predestined to renew the idea of Andrew Bogoljubski and his brother Vsevolod III for a united Russia, and bring it into permanent realization.

The picture given here of the political ideas in the Kievan State is, of course, incomplete. It could be supplemented by many other quotations, but even this survey, incomplete as it is, shows clearly that the Kievans had many opportunities to become acquainted with the main ideas of Byzantine political philosophy, and that they incorporated some important features of their own political development into the Byzantine pattern. This is most evident in the relations between the Church and the secular princes in the Kievan period. The penetration of Kievan political life by Byzantine ideas is the more remarkable because the democratic traditions of the Kievan State, represented by the role played by the *večes* in public life, did not favor the autocratic and monarchic tendencies characteristic of the Byzantine constitution. When these Kievan traditions gradually disappeared during the Mongolian period of Russian history, the autocratic and monarchic traditions transmitted by Byzantium, and echoed in the writings examined above, manifested themselves more readily, and helped the Moscovite princes in their "gathering of the Russian lands."